HERB.

CAB INTERNATIONAL
MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
LIBRARY
IMI \ Books / DON

COMMONWEALTH MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
18 MAR 1968

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/persoonia_1960_1_part-2_0

With the author's compliments

PERSOONIA
Published by the Rijksherbarium, Leiden
Volume 1, Part 2, pp. 173–302 (1960)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR POLYPORACEAE

M. A. Donk
Rijksherbarium, Leiden

COLLECTION MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
21 MAR 1960

PERSOONIA
Published by the Rijksherbarium, Leiden
Volume 1, Part 2, pp. 173–302 (1960)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR POLYPORACEAE

M. A. Donk
Rijksherbarium, Leiden

The family is taken in a broad, artificial sense, but exclusive of the Boletaceae and 'Meruliaceae' *sensu lato*. Of the generic names treated 229 are considered validly published, 37 not validly published, and 6 are excluded. Of each name details are given on various nomenclatorial aspects such as valid publication, typification, homonymy, status (legitimacy). The new combinations *Flaviporus brownei* (Humb. per Pers.) Donk and *Xerotinus afer* (Fr.) Donk are proposed. Attention is drawn to brief remarks made in connection with *Elmerina cladophora* (Berk.) Bres., *Polyporus scabrosus* Pers., *Chaetoporus tenuis* P. Karst., *Polyporus medulla-panis* (Jacq.) per Fr.; to the synonymy listed of *Merulius alveolaris* DC. and *Hexagonia mori* Pollini; to the valid publication of the names *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr., *Postia* Fr., and *Schizopora* Velen.; and to the typification of the names *Antrodia* P. Karst., *Lignosus* (Lloyd) ex Torrend, *Melanopus* Pat., *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill. and its synisonyms, *Phellinus* Quél., *Ungulina* Pat.

Introduction.—This paper forms part of a series in which an annotated nomenclatorial enumeration is given of all generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes.[1] Since the 'Polyporaceae' form a big group which has attracted much attention from taxonomists during the last few decades it was thought convenient to issue this tenth part as a special unit without too many connections with the preceding parts. For this reason some technical nomenclatorial terms are explained below.

Definition.—The 'Polyporaceae' as understood in the present paper are those fungi which Fries called, or would have called, Polyporei, as far as they are homobasidious, but with the exclusion of the genera referable to the 'Cyphellaceae' (see Part I of the series), the Boletaceae (Part IV) and the 'Meruliaceae' (Part IX). The latter in itself is a heterogeneous group in which the hymenium is continuous and hence the tube-edges are fertile (provided the specimens are not too old). It may well be that some names should have been referred to the 'Meruliaceae'

[1] The already published parts are as follows: Part I ("Cyphellaceae") was published *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 199–220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes), *in* Reinwardtia **2**: 435–440. 1954; Part III ("Clavariaceae"), *in* Reinwardtia **2**: 441–493. 1954; Part IV (Boletaceae), *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 275–313. 1955; Part V ("Hydnaceae"), *in* Taxon **5**: 69–80, 95–115. 1956; Part VI (Brachybasidiaceae, Cryptobasidiaceae, Exobasidiaceae), *in* Reinwardtia **4**: 113–118. 1956; Part VII ("Thelephoraceae"), *in* Taxon **6**: 17–28, 68–85, 106–123. 1957; Part VIII (Auriculariaceae, Septobasidiaceae, Tremellaceae, Dacrymycetaceae), *in* Taxon **7**: 164–178, 193–207, 236–250. 1958; and Part IX ("Meruliaceae" and Cantharellus s. str.), *in* Fungus **28**: 7–15. 1958.

Persoonia, Vol. 1, Part 1 was issued 28 December 1959

because their type species have a merulioid hymenophore, but if so their systematic position is still uncertain. The above formulation also implies the inclusion of the monotypic family Fistulinaceae, in which the tubes are free from each other.

Some generic names that one might expect to be treated on this occasion have already been dealt with in previous parts of the series. These names have been briefly mentioned with references to the places where they have been more fully treated. On the other hand some names given to fungi with a more or less typically lamellate hymenophore (for instance, *Xerotus* Fr.) will be found included because I believe them to represent polypores.

I most emphatically do not regard the 'Polyporaceae' in the above circumscription as a natural group. In addition to genera that are referable to the Corticiaceae, they also include several groups deserving the rank of families (Ganodermataceae, Fistulinaceae); and also contain the majority of the Hymenochaetaceae. Even reduced in this manner the remainder of the Polyporaceae are still not a homogeneous family in my opinion.

An attempt has been made to include all generic names effectively published at or after the introduction of the Linnean system of nomenclature. A distinction is made between, (i) names that are pre-Linnean or pre-Friesian, that is, published before the starting-point date of the Hymenomycetes (1821) and have never been taken up after that date and are not devalidated names; (ii) devalidated names and names published after the starting-point date but not validly published (spaced in italic type); and (iii) validly published names (heavy type). Excluded names are treated between square brackets (spaced in italic type if post-Friesian).

The registration of names in the present paper, even if they are considered validly published and legitimate or correct, does not denote the author's intention to assign to them any other status under the Code than the one they actually possess. New names or new combinations are unambiguously indicated.

EXPLANATION OF SOME TECHNICAL TERMS.—A general introduction to the series has been presented in the first Part. Most of what is written there will not be repeated, except for some general remarks and the explanation of some terms used in the present paper and not generally accepted.

Devalidated names are those names that would have been validly published if no later starting-ponts had been introduced. The first valid publication (in the starting-point book or after the starting-point date) of these names makes them *revalidated names*.

As to the *typification* of revalidated names, in my opinion the Code (1956), as it stands, permits us to consider them in most cases based on the original type, that is, on the type of the corresponding devalidated name (cf. Donk, "Typication and later starting-points", *in* Taxon **6**: 245–256. 1957). This question is of small importance in this instalment in view of the few generic names introduced before the starting-point and revalidated afterwards for a different group (cf. for instance *Favolus*, *Hexagonia*).

Priorable names are names validly published and counting in priority considerations, that is, 'available' and 'legitimate'. I try to avoid the latter term because it has been used in widely different meanings. Antonyms, *impriorable names*, validly published but not available for use as correct names.

Nomen anamorphosis, a name based on an imperfect state (*anamorphosis*).

Protonym. Neither a devalidated nor a validly published, though effectively published, name, taken up and validly published afterwards.

Basinym. A validly published name that has been replaced by one or more other validly published names (without change of type). The name changes, which may be either new names or new combinations, are *isonyms*. Names having the same basinym are *synisonyms*.

Typonym. A name having the same type as another name which is neither its basinym nor a synisonym. Usually typonyms are considered obligate synonyms, but this is quite true only when the ultimate type specimens are one and the same. For instance, if *Polyporus tuberaster* and *P. squamosus* are taken to belong to a single species, then *Polyporus* (based on *P. tuberaster*) and *Cerioporus* (based on *P. squamosus*) become typonyms, but to other mycologists the two species may be different and the two generic names not typonyms. The *ultimate type* of a type species is a specimen; the latter need not necessarily be the type specimen of the specific name assigned to it (cf. Donk, "On generic type species indicated by misapplied names", *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 483–486. 1952). It would be preferable to restrict the term typonym to names based on the same ultimate type specimen; these would be real obligate typonyms. This narrow and preferable meaning is not adopted here.

Monadelphous homonyms. A devalidated name may have been validly published afterwards in two or more different circumscriptions that are not typifiable by the same type; for instance, the name may have been revalidated in its original sense and independently once more with the exclusion of the type of the devalidated name. The principle of later starting-points (it may eventually appear) perhaps will not permit us to dispose of this second type of names as mere misapplications. Usually the type was excluded unintentionally because the author worked under some different nomenclatorial method from ours. The case of *Sistotrema* Fr. of which Fries expressly stated that it was different from *Sistotrema* Pers. is not an example of monadelphous homonyms but the deliberate introduction of a later homonym.

Metonymous homonyms are homonyms based on different types (as homonyms should be), but where the types belong to the same given taxon: homonyms which are at the same time metonyms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.—I am much indebted to Mr. D. A. Reid, the Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, for improvement of the English text and for other help and advice.

ALPHABETICAL ENUMERATION

Abortiporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 421. 1904; **32**: 483. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: abortus, arrested development of any organ, πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus distortus* Schw. = *Polyporus distortus* (Schw.) Fr.—This species was based on more or less deformed specimens as is plainly indicated by its specific epithet. Nomenclatorially it is of importance to agree on the question whether or not such specimens

are to be interpreted as monstrosities. Moreover, the status of *Polyporus distortus* as an independent species is still open to controversies. (i) It is often considered conspecific with the extremely plastic *Polyporus biennis* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr., for instance by Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 158. 1912; **4**: 549 *f.* 753. 1916] and Overholts (*1953:* 224); Graff (*in* Mycologia **31**: 476. 1939) assigned to it the rank of a variety of that species. (ii) Murrill (ll. cc.; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 64. 1907), Overholts (*in* Bull. Pennsylvania agric. Exp. Sta. No. 298: 23. 1933), and others keep it distinct from that species. — TYPONYMS. If the type species is considered to be conspecific with *P. biennis*, then *Irpicium* Bref. (1912) and *Heteroporus* Lázaro (1916) are typonyms. — STATUS. The priorability of the name *Abortiporus* depends on the status to be ascribed to *P. distortus:* if the latter is considered to be based on a monstrosity, both the generic and specific names would be nomina monstrositatium and, therefore, impriorable. A recent tendency is to regard *Abortiporus* as priorable: Overholts (l.c., 1933), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 85), Singer (*1944:* 68), Bondartsev (*1953:* 48, 537) and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 156). Recently O. Fidalgo (*in* Taxon **6**: 139. 1958) rejected *Abortiporus* as a name based on an abnormalty.

Agarico-carnis Paul., Traité Champ. **2**: Index & p. 97.[2] 1793 (devalidated name).[3]

Agarico-igniarium Paul., Traité Champ. **2**: Index & p. 84. 1793 (devalidated name).

Agarico-pulpa Paul., Traité Champ. **2**: Index & p. 101. 1793 (devalidated name).

Agarico-suber Paul., Traité Champ. **2**: Index & p. 74. 1793 (devalidated name).

[*Dendrosarcos* Paul., Ic. Champ. *pls. 9–11, 17–21, 23, 24, 26–28.* 1812–35 (not validly published).]

[*Fungoides.*—Treated separately in the present paper.]

Pyreium Paul., Mycétol. 28, 48. Circa 1812; Ic. Champ. *pls. 5–8.* 1812–35 (devalidated name).

Scutiger Paul., Mycétol. 49. Circa 1812; Ic. Champ. *pls. 31–34.* 1812–35 (devalidated name).

Xylometron Paul., Mycétol. 29, 48. Circa 1812; Ic. Champ. *pl. 3 fs. 1–4.* 1812–35 (devalidated name).

Paulet's publications on fungi consists of three parts. The first is the main work, "Traité des Champignons", published in two volumes in 1793. The second part is entitled "De la Mycétologie, ou traité historique, graphique, culinaire, et médical des Champignons" (49 pp.). This seems to be a completely forgotten publication

---

[2] The page-numbers stand for the pages on which the simultaneously published descriptions corresponding to the scientific names occur.

[3] See also under *Agaricon* (as *Agaricum*) and *Polyporus* for Paulet's applications of these two names.

which I know from a re-issue by Hoüel Paulet under the title, "Prospectus du Traité des Champignons, ..." This re-issue (according to the copy of the Rijksherbarium, Leiden) evidently consists of the original paper, a new title-page, and a few sample plates which may have been added on the occasion of the re-issue and may be different for each copy. No dates are given. From internal evidence (cf. p. 42) this publication in its original form seems to have appeared when the issue of the plates (see below) started, and hence it will be cited "Mycétol. Circa 1812". The re-issue is of a much later date and apparently appeared when the publication of the plates neared completion or had been completed, i.e. around 1835. In this publication Paulet explained why he changed certain generic names and defined others, new ones, that were to be used on the plates.[4] The third part of Paulet's work, comprising the plates, is entitled "Iconographie des Champignons". The plates were issued in fascicles at later dates than 1793 (1812–35); they are irregularly numbered and their exact dates of publication are not yet known. I have made no serious attempt to fill this gap. The plates (originally 223 in number) were re-issued later by Léveillé (1855) under the same title (reduced to 217). He added a new text and renumbered some of the plates.[5]

In the taxonomic part, in the second volume of the "Traité", Paulet used only French names for his genera and species, but he appended an Index (pages not numbered) in which he furnished a complete set of names in accordance with the binomial system. The relation between the French names and the binomial ones is clearly indicated by means of corresponding numerals and sequence. If the "Traité" were not pre-Friesian, I think most of the new generic and the binomial specific names would have been validly published, because of their intimate correlation with the French ones, which were accompanied by descriptions. I regard, them, therefore, as devalidated names. This (first) set of scientific names has been universally ignored, or overlooked.

A second set of names was used in the "Mycétologie" (generic ones) and on the plates specific names, also in agreement with the binomial system). The specific names on the plates were accompanied by the French names of 1793 (which were here and there more or less altered); each name was further accompanied by a reference to the page of the text on which the description of the species appeared. A part of this second set of scientific names dates from after 1821. The generic names on the plates appeared only as generic appellations in specific combinations and were consequently not validly re-published: they do not appear separately on the plates. An exception might, perhaps, be made for *Fungoides* 'Paul.', q.v., which one might consider as validly published on the basis of Art. 41 (2); it seems

---

[4] As I have done on similar occasions I do not consider the re-issue as 'post-Friesian', except for the new title-page added by the editor.

[5] The plates are usually cited according to this re-issue. This is done here too. The changes in the numbers will be found listed on page 135 of Léveillé's text and are also given by Laplanche (Icon. Champ. sup. 428).

to have been published after 1821. A number of the generic names of the "Iconographie" were taken up later and validly published by other authors.

Agarico-carnis Paul.—French name, Agaric-chair. Introduced with three species. These were included in the "Iconographie" in *Dendrosarcos* Paul., q.v. The first species is *A.-c. lingua bovis* Paul. = *Dendrosarcos hepaticus* (Schaeff.) Paul. = *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr. It is here selected as type species.

Agarico-igniarium Paul.—French name, Agaric-amadou. Introduced for six species, treated in the "Iconographie" under the name *Pyreium* Paul., q.v. They represent a sterile tissue (first species) and polypores. One of the latter is *A.-i. tegularium* Paul. = *Pyreium igniarium* (L.) Paul. sensu Paul. = *Polyporus torulosus* (Pers.) per Pers., as it was identified by Léveillé (op. cit., p. 5), correctly so, I think. The logical type would appear to be *A.-i. foliaceum* Paul. at least in part = *Pyreium fomentarium* (L.) Paul., which was the species most commonly used, according to Paulet, for the preparation of tinder (amadou), and to the description of which an extensive note was appended concerning the preparation and uses of this product (p. 88). The species itself, as conceived by the author, is a mixtum compositum, but it seems reasonable to accept that the 'amadou' he had chiefly in mind was a product of *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr. This would make *Agarico-igniarium* a typonym of *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr., q.v. However, it should be kept in mind that the earlier of the two specific names used by Paulet for *P. fomentarius*, viz. *A.-i. foliaceum*, might nomenclatorially be associated with something quite different from *P. fomentarius* and was presumably inspired by a fungus described by van Sterbeeck, and, perhaps, some other fungi (see Paulet, "Synonimie des Espèces", Traité Champ. **1**: 529 No. 29). Typonyms: *Pyreium* Paul. (circa 1812; devalidated name), *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. (1849), *Elfvingiella Murrill* (1914), *Placodes* Quél. (1886), *Ungulina* Pat. (1900), and compare *Xylopilus* P. Karst. (1882; nomen monstrositatis?).

Agarico-pulpa Paul.—French name, Agaric-pulpe. Introduced for five species (polypores), included in the "Iconographie" under '*Agaricum*' not to be confused with '*Agaricus*', also used by Paulet) and under *Polyporus* [viz. *A.-p. ulmi* Paul. and *A.-p. juglandis* (Schaeff.) Paul., both = *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr.]. The most important species from the author's point of view appears to be *A.-p. officinalis* (Jacq.) Paul. = *Agaricum purgans* (Gmel.) Paul. = *Polyporus officinalis* (Vill.) per Fr. It is here selected as type species. The first species is *A.-p. styptica* Paul. = *Agaricum stypticum* (Paul.) Paul. = *Polyporus sulphureus* (Bull.) per Fr. Typonyms: *Agaricopolyporus* Haller (1742; pre-Linnean name), *Agaricon* [Tourn.] Adans. 1763; devalidated name), and *Laricifomes* Kotlaba & Pouz. (1957).

Agarico-suber Paul.—French name, Agaric-liége. Introduced for nine species, now placed in such genera as *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr., *Lenzites* Fr. (*sensu lato*), *Coriolus* Quél., etc. Included in the "Iconographie" in '*Agaricus*' (not '*Agaricum*', also used by Paulet for a different set of fungi). The first species, here selected as type, is *A.-s. daedaleum* Paul. = *Agaricus quercinus* L. = *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr. Typonyms: *Agaricofungus* Haller (1642; pre-Linnean name), *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. (1821), *Striglia* Adans. per O.K. (1891; preoccupied?), and *Agaricus* Murrill (1905; preoccupied).

Dendrosarcos Paul.—This was introduced for Paulet's earlier genera *Agarico-carnis* Paul., q.v., and *Agarico-fungus* Paul., and also covered a part of *Fungus* as applied by Paulet ("familles" 19, 20). Paulet's first species, *D. hepaticus* (Schaeff.) Paul. = *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr., the only non-agaric member, was considered type species by Earle (*in* Bull. New York bot. Gdn **5**: 385. 1909). *Dendrosarcos* is not mentioned in the "Mycétologie". Taken up as *Dendrosarcus* O.K., an agaric genus.

Pyreium Paul. —Apparently another name for what Paulet formerly called *Agarico-igniarium* Paul., q.v. Its content is given as follows:

"*Pyreium*. . . . Ce genre, entrevu encore par Dillen, comprend toutes fongosités des arbres de substance cotonneuse et sèche, tous les agarics dits astringens ou amadouviers, et se compose du *Boletus igniarius* et *fomentarius* de Linné, du *Bol. vernicosus* Berg., du *Xylostroma* de Tode ou *Racodium* de Persoon, de quelques espèces d'*himantia* de ce dernier. . .."—Paulet (Mycétol. 29. Circa 1812).

As in the case of *Agarico-igniarium* it seems best to consider *Boletus fomentarius* L. = *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr. as type. For typonyms, see under *Agarico-igniarium* Paul. Murrill (*1903:* 89) took as type Paulet's first species in the "Iconographie", *Pyreium giganteum* Paul., adding *Xylostroma giganteum* (Paul.) Tode [!] as the correct name; it belongs to the sterile, sheet-like mycelia.

Scutiger Paul.—This represents a part of what Paulet originally called the genus *Fungus* ("familles" 22–24); it includes polypores, hydnums, and an agaric. Murrill (see *Scutiger*) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 88) took *Scutiger tuberosus* Paul. = *Polyporus pes-caprae* Pers. per Fr. as type species of the name as published by Paulet. Taken up later; see *Scutiger* Paul. per Murrill.

Xylometron Paul.—This is a part of *Agarico-suber* Paul., q.v., ("familles" 3 and 4, and the first species of "famille" 5), including three species in all, depicted in the "Iconographie" as *X. lobatum* Paul., *X. spinosum* Paul., and *X. sanguineum* (L.) Paul. = *Polyporus sanguineus* (L.) per Fr. The first two species have not yet been identified with certainty, although it may be assumed that they represent polypores. Murrill (*1903*) considered the name "based on *X. lobatum* and two other species" (p. 89) and further remarked, "Type indeterminate" (p. 101); W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 100) also gave *X. lobatum* as type species. This is not acceptable. When the generic name was formally introduced (Paulet, Mycétol. 29) its author mentioned only one species by name and that one is here considered type: "[*Xylometron*] se compose du *Boletus cinnabarinus* de Jacquin, et de quelques autres espèces non indiquées." Typonym: *Pycnoporus* P. Karst. (1881).

Agarico-fungus Haller, Enum. meth. Stirp. Helv. indig. **1**: 57. 1742 (pre-Linnean name). — This was the name von Haller used for the gill fungi with a sessile cap (without a stalk). He included seven species of which the first is *Agarico-fungus lamellis crassissimis, rigidis* Haller (with as a synonym "*Vonkhout* Sterbeck n. 128. p. 162"). Apparently this was an inclusively conceived taxon ("Facies superior . . . hirsuta . . ."), which nevertheless may presumably be reduced to the

synonymy of *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr. It is here selected as type. One of the other species is identifiable with *Schizophyllum commune* Fr. per Fr. (no. 4). — Typonyms: *Agarico-suber* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. (1821), *Striglia* Adans. per O.K. (1891; preoccupied?), and *Agaricus* Murrill (1905, preoccupied).

Agarico-igniarium Paul.—See under *Agarico-carnis*.

Agaricon [Tourn.] Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 10. 1763 (devalidated name). — Agaricus (or Agaricum or Agaricon) is an ancient name originally used for a fungus that was for a considerable period highly esteemed and widely known for its numerous alleged medical properties, viz. *Polyporus officinalis* (Vill.) per Fr.

Pre-Linnean name: *Agaricus* Tourn., Elem. Bot. **1**: 441. 1694; Inst. **1**: 562. 1700.—The above mentioned ancient name was taken up and introduced by de Tournefort in his binary system for more or less pileate wood fungi in general. His first, and doubtlessly his leading, species was "*Agaricus sive Fungus Laricis* C. B. pin. 375" = *Polyporus officinalis*; one of his other species is the Judas's ear, *Hirneola auricula-judae* (Bull. per St.-Am.: Fr.) Berk. The most outstanding subsequent uses before 1753 are those by (i) Dillenius (Cat. Pl. ca Gissam nasc. 191 & App. 75. 1719, as *Agaricus*), who included species with fruit-bodies growing on wood, dimidiate, without a stipe, and the hymenophore generally poroid but also more or less lamellate or smooth; and (ii) Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 117. 1729, as *Agaricum*), who made it an even still more inclusive genus.

After 1753 the name was variously applied, but mainly either in the Linnean circumscription (including *Agaricus campestris* L. per Fr. , or in its original Tournefortian sense (including *Polyporus officinalis*). Only the latter applications will be considered in the present case. If the starting-point date of fungi had remained 1753, *Agaricus* (polyporaceous genus) would have been considered validly published for the first time, I think, by Adanson (l.c.), although this author did not adhere to the Linnean or Tournefortian nomenclatorial systems.[6] Adanson's description leaves no doubt as to what he intended to cover by the name:

"*Agaricon.* Diosc. Tour. *t. 330.* Mich. *t. 60* [*Figure.*] Chapeau demi-orbiculaire doublé en-dessous de trous verticaux ou de tuyaux verticaux. Attaché par le coté sans tige. [*Substance.*] Charnuë ou subéreuse. [*Graines.* Ovoïdes couvrant la surface interne des trous]."— Adanson (l.c.).

It may be confidently assumed that Adanson included all of the species of the genus *Agaricus* Tourn. (l.c., 1700) answering to his description, and not only the two polypores figured by de Tournefort on plate 330. According to Murrill (*1903:* 88) this plate "represents *P[olyporus] igniarius* (L.) Fr." (which I doubt) and he accepted that species as type of *Agaricon* Adans. (l.c., and op. cit., p. 98), a conclusion

[6] The earlier use by P. Browne (Hist. Jamaica 76. 1756), another non-Linnean author, would not have represented the valid publication of the name in this or in any other sense: that author described three species under *Agaricus*, but did not produce a generic description.

rejected here (cf. "Diosc."!). Micheli's cited plate (Nov. Pl. Gen. *pl. 60.* 1729) represents *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr.

von Haller (Hist. Stirp. indig. Helv. inch. **2**: 134. 1768), another 'non-binomial' author, preferred the form *Agaricum* which he applied to a genus consisting mainly of species of *Thelephora* Ehrh. ex Fr. (*sensu lato*), *Tremella* L. (including *Dacrymyces* spp.), etc., that is, for a group of wood-loving fungi devoid of gills, veins, tubes, or spines. This name and emended genus were accepted by Scopoli (Intr. Hist. nat. 361. 1777). Such a taxon excludes the more typical elements of de Tournefort's genus.

The introduction of the Tournefortian genus *Agaricus* into the Linnean binomal nomenclatorial system was presumably first performed by de Lamarck (Encycl. méth. Bot. **1**: 49. [1783]) and de Jussieu (Gen. Pl. 4. 1789). These authors, and others, refused to follow Linnaeus in his radical deviation from what was at that period the well founded use of the name, and they kept as closely as possible to the Tournefortian genus. De Lamarck's circumscription corresponds to that of *Boletus* L. (1753), thus, to polypores as well as Boleti in general; de Jussieu applied *Agaricus* in a more restricted delimitation by excluding *Suillus* [Mich.] Haller,[7] the Boleti. Paulet thought it fit to accept at the same time a genus *Agaricum* and another one, *Agaricus*. The former group (Paulet, Mycétol. 29. Circa 1812; Ic. Champ. *pls. 12, 14–16*) equals his earlier genus *Agarico-pulpa* Paul., with *Polyporus officinalis* as the leading species. His other genus (Mycétol. 28. Circa 1812; Ic. Champ. *pl. 1 fs. 1, 2, pl. 2* covers his earlier genus *Agarico-suber* Paul. His *Agaricum* should be interpreted as a correct application of the Tournefortian name. The last author to apply the name *Agaricus* for a group of polypores, was, as far as I am aware, Roussel (Fl. Calvad., 2e Ed., 71. 1806). His "*Agaricus*, n." [n. = *nobis*] was defined: "tissu subéreux ou coriace; chapeau dimidié, sessile; pores correspondans aux tubes"; one of the species is *Boletus laricis* Rubel (= *Polyporus officinalis*), which makes it a certain application of *Agaricus* Tourn.

I have not come across a valid publication of *Agaricus* Tourn. after the starting-point date (1821) of these fungi. — Homonyms: *Agaricus* L. (1753; see p. 182) per Fr. (1821) and *Agaricus* Murrill (1905; preoccupied).

Generic names based on *Polyporus officinalis* are *Agarico-polyporus* Haller, *Agarico-pulpa* Paul., and *Laricifomes* Kotlaba & Pouz.

Agarico-polyporus Haller, Enum. meth. Stirp. Helv. indig. **1**: 26. 1742 (pre-Linnean name). — This was introduced for "*Agaricorum* Michelii Ordines 2, 3, 4 & 5. *Boleti* Linnaei species acaulae." Thus clearly a restriction of *Agaricus* Tourn. to pore-bearing species, inclusive of the type species of that name, viz. the species called afterwards *Polyporus officinalis* (Vill.) per Fr. (*Agarico-polyporus albus, pulpa farinosa, subtus tubulosus fuscus* Haller). The latter may be taken as type species of von Haller's generic name. Typonyms: *Agarico-pulpa* Paul. (1793; devalidated name) and *Laricifomes* Kotlaba & Pouz. (1957); and compare *Agaricon* [Tourn.] Adans.

---

[7] Of 1742; in 1768 von Haller included *Suillus* in *Polyporus* Mich.

Agarico-pulpa.—See under *Agarico-carnis.*

Agarico-suber Paul.—See under *Agarico-carnis.*

Agarico-suillus Haller, Enum. meth. Stirp. Helv. indig. **1**: 29. 1742 (pre-Linnean name). — Introduced for *Agarico-suillus mollis ruberrimus* Haller, a name for a fungus now called *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr.: "*Agaricorum* Ordo 1. Micheli" (Nov. Pl. Gen. 117 *pl. 60.* 1729). Typonyms: *Fistulina* Bull. per Fr. (1821), *Hypodrys* Pers. per Pers. (1825), and *Buglossus* Wahlenb. per Wahlenb. (1826).

Agaricum.—See under *Agaricon.*

Agaricus Tourn. (pore-bearing fungi).—See *Agaricon.*

Agaricus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 83, 1905; **32**: 491. 1905. — TYPE SPECIES: *Agaricus quercinus* L.

Not *Agaricus* L., Sp. Pl. **2**: 1176. 1753.—Type species (selected): *Agaricus campestris* L., the common field-mushroom, Agaricaceae; compare Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 149–151. 1949).

Linnaeus, quite arbitrarily, transferred the denomination *Agaricus* from the polypores (and other epixylous fungi) to the agarics; it would have been more correct if he had taken up for the latter group either *Fungus* Tourn. (originally including agarics as well as Boleti) or *Amanita* Dill. (which corresponded exactly to *Agaricus* L.).

"*Agaricus* (Dill.) L"; Murrill *in* J. Mycol. **9**: 87, 98. 1903 (without description); ll. cc. —During a short period Murrill took *Agaricus quercinus* L. = *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr. as type species of the Linnean name, which he, therefore, substituted for *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr., thus establishing a monadelphous homonym of *Agaricus* L. per Fr.

"*Agaricus* (Dill.) L. Sp. Pl. 1176. 1753. — Based on *A. quercinus* L. Fl. Suec. 380. n. 1082. 1745, where this species is directly referred to Dillenius' genus *Agaricus*. Since Linnaeus states that he adopted the genus *Agaricus* from Dillenius and this species is the only one directly cited by Linnaeus as belonging to the genus, it must stand as its type."—Murrill (*1903:* 87). "This is the only species common to Linnaeus and Dillenius the author of the genus."—Murrill (l.c., p. 83, 1905).

This species was excluded by Fries when he validly re-published *Agaricus* L. and hence cannot be maintained as type species of *Agaricus* L. per Fr. (1821). — Later Murrill abandoned his original typification and regarded *Agaricus campestris* as type species of the Linnean generic name (as is now universally done).

TYPONYMS: see under *Daedalea.* — STATUS. Impriorable as a later homonym.

Albatrellus S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 645. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: albarello and arbatrello, Italian fungus names. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected)

Boletus albidus Pers. = *Polyporus ovinus* (Schaeff.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for polypores with a central stalk and an orbicular, convex pileus. The two (British) species included by Gray were *Boletus albidus* (first species), and *Boletus fuligineus* Pers. = *Polyporus fuligineus* (Pers.) per Fr., an imperfectly known and still doubtful species. — TYPIFICATION. Murrill [*1903:* 91, 98; as "*A. ovinus* (Schaeff.)"; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 482. 1905] took the first species as type. This makes *Albatrellus* the legitimate name for the genus now called *Scutiger* Murrill (1903), as long as *Polyporus ovinus* and *Polyporus pes-caprae* Pers. per Fr. are kept within the same genus. Singer (*1944:* 78 suggested, therefore, the selection of *Polyporus fuligineus*. This would result in making *Albatrellus* something of a nomen dubium—for the time being. It would also make the name *Albatrellus* a potential danger for another later generic name. Personally, I am all in favour of adhering to the species indicated by Murrill. It was also accepted by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 85; *1953:* 7), Imazeki (*1943:* 38), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 154). One of my reasons for supporting Murrill's choice is that some mycologists need a name for a substantial segregation from *Scutiger*, with *P. ovinus* as an outstanding member. — REMARK. Gray called his genus "*Albatrellus*. Micheli." However, Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 1729) had no genus of that name but mentioned "Albarello, Arbatrello, o Porcinella" as Italian names (p. 128) for a species of *Suillus* Mich., a Boletus. — SPELLING. It is just possible that '*Albatrellus*' (scientific name) and 'Albatrello' (popular name) as used by Gray are unintentional errors for 'Arbatrellus' and 'Arbatrello', in view of the Italian name arbatrello from which these names were derived. — TYPONYM: *Caloporus* Quél. (1886; preoccupied) and *Ovinus* (Lloyd) Torrend (1920).

Alveolinus Rafin., Anal. Nat. ou Tab. Univ. 211. 1815 (not validly published). — A nomen nudum for a genus of "Boletidia", a family including Boleti as well as polypores.

Amauroderma Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 366. 1905. – ETYMOLOGY: ἀμαυρός, dark, obscure: δέρμα, skin. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Fomes regulicolor* (Berk.) ex Cooke.—According to Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **14**: 226. 1916) this is a synonym of *Polyporus schomburgkii* Mont. & Berk. – SCOPE. Murrill's genus coincides with *Ganoderma* sect. *Amauroderma* Pat. (see below). – REMARK. Murrill stated: "The generic name here employed was used by Patouillard (Tax. Hymen. 105. 1900) for a subdivision of *Ganoderma* . . .." Nevertheless it does not seem permissible to consider Patouillard's name as the basinym. First, Murrill did not cite Patouillard as the author in parentheses after the generic name, as he would have done somewhere in his publications if he himself had regarded the generic name an isonym. Secondly, *Fomes regulicolor* (Murrill's type species) was not mentioned by Patouillard (either when the sectional name was first published, or in 1900), although its synonym, *Polyporus schomburgkii*, was. There is no indication that Murrill was aware of the identity of the two species. Therefore, the citation "*Amauroderma* (Pat.) Murrill", sometimes to be encountered in literature, is incorrect.

— HOMONYM: *Amauroderma* (Pat.) Torrend (1920). See next name. A metonymous homonym.

Amauroderma (Pat.) Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920. — ETYMOLOGY: ἀμαυρός, dark, obscure; δέρμα, skin. Gender: n.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus auriscalpium* Pers.

BASINYM: *Ganoderma* sect. *Amauroderma* Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **5**: 75. 1889.—Patouillard included 19 species; the first was *Ganoderma neglectum* Pat. Illustrated on accompanying plates were: *Ganoderma subrugosum* Bres. & Pat. apud Pat. (*pl. 10 f. 1*), *G. rufobadium* Pat. (*pl. 10 f. 3*), *G. auriscalpium* (Pers.) Pat. (*pl. 11 f. 2*), and *G. praetervisum* Pat. (*pl. 11 f. 3*). (It may be remembered that Patouillard had already published illustrations of some of the other species included.) "*Ganoderma rugosum* Nees"[8] is not to be found among the species of section *Amauroderma*, but of *Ganoderma* sect. *Ganoderma* Pat.

VALID PUBLICATION. When reviewing the Brasilian species, Torrend treated Patouillard's taxon as a genus and headed it "*Amauroderma* Pat. (Bol. Soc. Myc. vol. V, p. 75)." In so doing he raised Patouillard's section to generic rank and thus created a later (metonymous) homonym of *Amauroderma* Murrill, the existence of which he was apparently unaware. Torrend also supplied a generic description.

SCOPE. Torrend did not alter the circumscription of Patouillard's group as it was treated by Lloyd under the name of "Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. "*Amaurodermus*" (see also below); it may be assumed that he relied on Lloyd's monographic account of the group rather than on the earlier one by Patouillard. His paper was concerned only with the Brasilian representatives.

TYPIFICATION. The type species (*P. auriscalpium*) for Torrend's name was chosen by Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 283. 1949). One may, perhaps, have preferred *Polyporus schomburgkii*, which would make *Amauroderma* (Pat.) Torrend a later typonymous homonym of *Amauroderma* Murrill, if one accepts Bresadola's view of the conspecificity of the two species. However, it was not illustrated by Patouillard and he did not include it among the selected examples of *Ganoderma* sect. *Amauroderma* in 1900 ("*G. umbraculum* Fr., *G. auriscalpium* Pers., *G. macer* Bk., *G. exile* Bk., *G. omphalodes* Bk., etc.").

VARIANT SPELLING: "*Amaurodermus*"; J. Rick *in* Brotéria (Sér. Ci. nat.) **7** (1): 11. 1938.—"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Amaurodermus* of Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 110. 1912] may well be regarded as a variant spelling or an isonym of *Ganoderma* sect. *Amauroderma* Pat. Although Lloyd sometimes treated the sectional epithet as a generic appellation, especially in indices and in connection with figures, he never attributed generic value to it. Torrend (see also under *Lentus*), who applied several of Lloyd's subdivisional epithets of *Polyporus* to genera, did not adopt this form, but adopted Patouillard's original spelling. When Rick used '*Amaurodermus*'

---

[8] *Ganoderma subrugosum* is, according to Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 121. 1912], a synonym of this name.

as a generic name he might well have intended to use *Amauroderma* (Pat.) Torrend, at the same time misspelling it because he was more familiar with Lloyd's modification, rather than converting the latter into a generic name. He did not indicate an author for it and furnished a non-Latin description (in a key).

HOMONYM: *Amauroderma* Murrill (1905). See preceding name.

Amaurodermus.—See *Amauroderma* (Pat.) Torrend.

[*Amphitretia* Hill, General nat. Hist. **2**: 31. 1751. — This pre-Linnean name was given to a genus of Hill's class of Fungi, "Such as grow in horizontal direction on trees." The description contains: ". . . growing horizontally, or irregularly, and consisting of a light, spungy matter, on every surface of which there are foramina . . .." There are four original species; of these, the first three Hill identified with the three species of Micheli's *Agaricum* ordo V (Nov. Pl. Gen. 121 *pl. 63.* 1729). He depicted one species; the figure was copied from Micheli (*pl. 63 f. 2*). — The genus has been mentioned as belonging to the polypores, but is is doubtful whether we are dealing with hymenomycetes in this case.]

Amylocystis Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66, 67. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 38, 234. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ἄμυλον, starch; κύστις, bladder. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only species mentioned): *Polyporus lapponicus* Romell. — PROTONYM: *Amylocystis* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 52. 1941. — Not validly published: no Latin description. Introduced for the type species.

Amyloporia Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66, 76. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 36, 149. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ἄμυλον, starch; the genus *Poria.* Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only species mentioned): *Poria calcea* (Fr. ex Pers.) Cooke sensu Bres.—When the name *Amyloporia* was first introduced, but not validly published, the authors indicated the type as "*A*[*myloporia*] *calcea* (Fr.) B.-S."; and when Singer validly published the name, the type was mentioned in precisely the same manner. Bondartsev (*1953*) has no species of that name; although he recognizes a genus *Amyloporia*, *Amyloporia calcea* is nowhere applied or even listed in synonymy. I would conclude that the type species the two authors had in mind is *Polyporus vulgaris* var. "β. *P. calceus*" Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 381. 1821 = *Polyporus vulgaris* var. *calceus* (Fr.) *ex* Pers., Mycol. europ. **2**: 101. 1825 = *Polyporus calceus* (Fr. ex Pers.) Schw. [not *Polyporus calceus* Berk. & Br.] = *Poria calcea* (Fr. ex Pers.) Cooke, Bres. [not *Poria calcea* (Berk. & Br.) Sacc. & P. Syd.] sensu Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **6**: 41. 1908). This species, as interpreted by Bresadola, is according to that author himself the same as *Poria lenis* (P. Karst.) Sacc. (". . . videtur forma hujus speciei . . ."). This identity is now considered firmly established. For the best description and illustrations of *Poria lenis*, see Eriksson (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr.

43: 11 *f. 3, pl. 2.* 1949); and compare Romell (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **20**: 12. 1926), who also concluded, "As this species is never 'durissimus' it cannot reasonably be referred to *Pol. calceus* of Fries, as done in Ann. myc. VI. p. 41 (1908)." It looks as if the identification of the type species with *Poria lenis* is correct since Bondartsev (op. cit., p. 149) cites "*Poria calcea* (Fr.) Bres. in Ann. Myc. VI, p. 11 [= 41] (1908)" as a synonym of *Amyloporia lenis* (P. Karst.) Bond. & Sing. ex Bondarts. However, it should be remarked (i) that neither the fruit-bodies nor the hyphae of *Poria lenis* are amyloid as in expressed in the generic name, and (ii) that one of the other species Bondartsev & Singer listed for their genus is the same *Poria lenis*.

PROTONYM: *Amyloporia* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 50. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. Four species were mentioned. — SCOPE. In 1944, when the name was validly published, the only species mentioned was the type, but the intended scope should apparently be taken to be the same as the one attributed to the genus in 1941. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Amyloporis*"; Imazeki *in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6: 68. 1943 (incidental mention).

Amyloporis.—See *Amyloporia*.

Anastomaria Rafin.—'Boletaceae' (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 276. 1955).

Anisomyces Pilát *in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 11. 1936; **3**: 331. 1940; (nomen nudum). — Type species (only original species): *Trametes odorata* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. — The generic name was not validly published: no Latin description. — Homonym: *Anisomyces* Theiss. & H. Syd. (1914; Sphaeriales, Ascomycetes). — Typonyms: *Ceratophora* Humb. per Corda (1842; nomen monstrositatis vel anamorphosis) and *Osmoporus* Sing. (1944). Compare also *Ceriomyces* Corda (1837; not *Ceriomyces* Murrill).

Anthrodia.—See *Antrodia*.

Antrodia P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 40. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 138. 1880). — ETYMOLOGY: ἀντρώδης, full of caves. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Trametes serpens* (Fr. per Fr.) Fr.—Compare Baxter (*in* Pap. Michigan Acad. Sci. **25**: *pl. 2.* 1940: photographs of type specimen of species). — SCOPE. Introduced for *Trametes* sect. *Resupinati* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 585. 1874), although this was not especially indicated. Seven species were listed; the first is *Trametes mollis* (Sommerf.: Fr.) Fr., and the third, *Trametes serpens*. — TYPIFICATION. Presumably only the first three species were known to the author through specimens (from Finland); they are "*Ant. mollis* (Somm.), *Epilobii* (Karst.), *serpens* (Fr.)": compare Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 18. 1881). Soon afterwards Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**. 1882) distributed the species over the genera "*Trametes* Fr. Karst.", "*Daedalea* (Pers.) Karst.", and "*Physisporus* Chev."; and the name *Antrodia* appeared as a synonym or epithet of a section of *Physisporus* Chev.

(p. 63), in which group two of the original species (*Trametes serpens* and *T. isabellinus* Fr.) were placed. However, still later Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 323. 1889) re-introduced the (generic) name and on that occasion restricted it (in a monograph of Finnish species) to *Trametes serpens* only. It seems, therefore, logical to consider the latter as type species, since the author of *Antrodia* himself left no doubt that he regarded it as such. The same species is, herewith, indicated as type of *Trametes* sect. *Resupinati* Fr., mentioned above — Murrill (*1903:* 93, 98; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 354. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 82. 1907), Ainsworth & Bisby (Dict. Fungi 16. 1943), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 92; *1953:* 9), Bondartsev & Singer *1941:* 61; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66 , Imazeki (*1943:* 38), Bondartsev (*1953:* 47), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 161) considered the first species, *Trametes mollis*, as type. Because it was excluded long before by Karsten himself, and because *Trametes serpens* was to him the actual type species, it has to be rejected. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Anthrodia*"; P. Henn. *in* Natürl. PflFam. **1** (1**): 179. 1898 (as a synonym).

Aporpium Bond. & Sing. ex Sing.—Tremellaceae (see Donk *in* Taxon **7**: 166. 1958).

Artolenzites R. Falck *in* Hausschwammforsch. **3**: 37. 1909. — Etymology: ἄρτος, bread; the genus *Lenzites*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Lenzites repanda* (Pers.) Fr.—This species, as well as the other two mentioned by Falck, are now sometimes regarded as conspecific with *Lenzites palisoti* (Fr.) Fr. [Bresadola *in* Hedwigia **53**: 50. 1912 kept *L. applanata* (Fr. ex Klotzsch) Fr. apart.] Others have included it in *Daedalea ambigua* Berk. [= *Boletus aesculi-flavae* Schw. = *D. aesculi* ("Schw": Fr.) Murrill sensu Murrill]; see Overholts (*1953:* 127). — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. The following note is all Falck had to say:

"... Die Gattungen *Leucolenzites* und *Artolenzites* ... Eine weitere von *Lenzites* abzugrenzende Gattung umfasst die in den Tropen allverbreiteten Formen: *L. repanda* Mont., *L. applanata* Fr., *L. polita* Fr. [9] Ich habe nur einige Exemplare dieser Arten in Händen; soweit sich hieraus ein Urteil gewinnen lässt, ist für diese Formen das geringe Tiefenwachstum der Balken besonders charakteristisch. Sie würden hiernach als Gattung *Artolenzites* (Schmalbalkenträger) abzutrennen sein."—Falck (l.c.).

Perhaps better to be regarded as a nomen provisorium? — TYPIFICATION. The first species is selected here.

Aschersonia Endl., Gen. Pl. Suppl. 2: 103. 1842 — ETYMOLOGY: F. M. Ascherson. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Laschia crustacea* Jungh.—See under *Laschia* Jungh. — BASINYM: *Laschia* Jungh. (1838), q.v. —

---

[9] The correct authors citations are '(Pers.) Fr.', '(Fr. ex Klotzsch) Fr.', and '(Fr.) Fr.' respectively.

TYPIFICATION. See *Laschia* Jungh. — REMARK. A name change for the preoccupied basinym.[10] — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Achersonia*": Lév. *in* Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) III **2**: 194. 1844 (incidental mention). — SYNISONYM: *Junghuhnia* Corda, q.v. — HOMONYM: *Aschersonia* Mont. (1848; Nectrioidaceae, Deuteromycetes). — TYPONYM. See under *Hymenogramme* Berk. & Mont. — NOMEN REJICIENDUM. Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 159, 182. 1941) proposed *Aschersonia* Mont. [*in* Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) III **10**: 121. 1848] as a nomen conservandum. It covers a genus of imperfect fungi now universally used[11] and which has grown out to rather a large group. Nobody has yet found it necessary to resurrect *Aschersonia* Endl. which at present includes at most one species (see under *Laschia* Jungh.). Compare also Hennings (*in* Festschr. zu P. Aschers. siebz. Geburtst. 71. 1904). Rogers *in* Farlowia **3**: 434. 1949 supported the proposal. It has been approved by the Special Committee for Fungi (*in* Taxon **2**: 30. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45**: 317. 1953 and the Paris Congress cf. *in* Taxon **3**: 233. 1954).

Asterochaete (Pat.) Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 58. 1941; Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66. 1944; Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 45. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ἀστήρ, -έρος, star; χαίτη, hair. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus megaloporus* Mont., not *Polyporus megaloporus* Pers. — BASINYM: *Leucoporus* sect. *Asterochaete* Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **30**: 40. 1914.—Introduced with four species. Patouillard first noted the curious cystidia, which induced the establishment of the name, in *Favolus princeps* Berk. & C., and remarked in 1914 (when he coined the sectional epithet) of the four species included by him: "elles appartiennent toutes au même groupe que *Favolus princeps*". (This latter name he treated as a mere synonym of *Polyporus megaloporus* Mont. when he formally named the group. The type species of the basinym was in this way plainly indicated by the author. The first species is *Polyporus russiceps* Berk. & Br. — VALID PUBLICATION. Bondartsev & Singer added a description (1941; no descriptive matter at all in 1944), but it is not in Latin. They called the genus "*Asterochaete* (Pat.)". This is barely a normal reference to the basinym even in the most concise form, but since it tells us that Patouillard published an infrageneric epithet 'Asterochaete' it may be accepted as valid. — TYPIFICATION. Bondartsev & Singer (l.c.; *apud* Singer, l.c.), Singer (*in* Lilloa **22**: 283. 1951), Bondartsev (l.c.), and W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 11) indicated *Polyporus megaloporus* as type species. Since the valid publication of the generic name depends on a reference (rather than an accompanying description) this amounts to a mere selection on the part of the authors of the generic name rather than to an 'original' designation. — HOMONYM: *Asterochaete* C. Nees (1834; Cyperaceae). — STATUS. Even if validly published, impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

---

[10] There is no reason to regard *Aschersonia* Endl. as not validly published because no species were mentioned, as has been suggested. A description and a reference to the basinym were furnished.

[11] O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 538. 1898] changed *Aschersonia* Mont. into *Underwoodina* O.K.

Aurantioporellus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 486. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Aurantioporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus alboluteus* (Ell. & Ev.) Ell. & Ev.

Aurantioporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 487. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: aurantius, orange; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only species definitely included): *Polyporus pilotae* Schw.—Now regarded as synonymous with *Polyporus croceus* (Pers.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Apart from the type species two "species inquirendae" were mentioned.

Baeostratoporus Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 67, 68. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: βαιός, small; stratum, layer; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Polyporus braunii* Rabenh.—In my opinion this species is the same as *Polyporus rufoflavus* Berk. & C.; it may be known as **Flaviporus brownei** (Humb. per Pers.) Donk, *comb. nov.* [basinym, *Polyporus brownei* (Humb.) *per* Pers., Mycol. europ. **2**: 121. 1825]. — PROTONYM: *Baeostratoporus* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 62. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. — SCOPE. From the earlier publication (1941) it becomes clear that the authors originally included two species. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Baeostratosporus*": *in* Rev. appl. Mycol., Suppl. No. 9: 98. 1944.—An error (cf. op. cit., No. 10: 105. 1945). — TYPONYM. I regard *Flaviporus* Murrill (1905), based on *Polyporus rufoflavus*, as a typonym.

Baeostratosporus.—See *Baeostratoporus*.

[*Bizzozeriella* Speg. (Fungi guaran. Pug. II) *in* An. Soc. cient. argentina **26**: 73. 1888; Sacc., Syll. Fung. **10**: 716. 1892.

Underwoodina O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 538. 1898.

O. Kuntze introduced *Underwoodina* as a name change for *Aschersonia* Mont. "Berk. & Mont.": 1848, the name of a genus of imperfect Ascomycetes and pre-occupied by *Aschersonia* Endl., q.v. When he published the new name he excluded *Aschersonia basicystis* Berk. & C.: "Die Arten [von *Aschersonia* Mont.] sind mit Ausschluss von *A. basicystis* = *Bizzozeriella basicystis* OK. nach Saccardo Sylloge von *Aschersonia* . . . übertragen." This genus to which *A. basicystis* was referred is *Bizzozeriella* Speg., another genus of imperfect Ascomycetes.[12] It is, therefore, surprising to find that W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 13, 97) distilled from these facts the existence, (i) of a genus *Bizzozeriella* "O. Kuntze", with "*B. basicystis* O. Kuntze" as type species, and (ii) a genus of Polyporaceae, *Underwoodina* O.K., also with "*Bizzozeriella basicystis* O. Kuntze" as type species. Evidently the assumption of the polyporaceous nature of the latter genus rests on a confusion with *Aschersonia* Endl.]

[12] Compare Saccardo (Syll. Fung. **10**: 717. 1892), who stated under *Bizzozeriella* Speg.: "Huic generi sine ullo dubio *Asch. basicystis* B. et C. est ascribenda."

[*Bizzozeriella* 'O.K.'—See *Bizzozeriella* Speg.]

Bjercardera.—See *Bjerkandera.*

Bjerkandera P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 38. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 137. 1880). — ETYMOLOGY: C. Bjerkander. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus adustus* (Willd.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with seven species; first species, *Polyporus adustus*. The genus, as originally published, equals Fries's *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* A. *Anodermei* sect. *Lenti* group ** Contextu albo (Epicr. 456. 1838; Hym. europ. 549. 1874), that is, a considerable part of *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori dichroi* (Fries *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 54. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 38) inclusive of *Polyporus dichrous* Fr. per Fr. — TYPIFICATION. Later when giving a survey of the Finnish polypores, Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 18. 1881) enumerated as examples of the typical part of *Bjerkandera* (in which genus he then also included *Hansenia* P. Karst.) only four species, in this order: *Polyporus fumosus* (Pers.) per Fr., *P. adustus*, *P. dichrous*, and *P. amorphus* Fr. When Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 477. 1905; **32**: 633. 1906; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 40. 1907) took up the genus, he considerably restricted it and regarded as type species *Polyporus adustus*, the first species of 1879, already indicated as such by him before (Murrill, *1903:* 93, 98). He was followed by Donk (*1933:* 160); W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86; *1953:* 13); Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 52; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Imazeki (*1943:* 39), Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 17. 1948), Bondartsev (*1953:* 38), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 168). — A more judicious choice would have been *Polyporus dichrous*. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Bjercardera*": J. Schroet. *in* Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1): 469. 1888 (as a synonym). — TYPONYM: *Myriadoporus* Peck (1884; nomen monstrositatis).

Boletopsis Fayod *in* Malpighia **3**: 72. 1889. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Boletus*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Polyporus leucomelas* (Pers. per Schw.) Pers. (by error as *Boletopsis* "*melaleuca*"). — HOMONYM: *Boletopsis* P. Henn. (1897; Boletaceae).

Boletus S. F. Gray.—See under *Boletus* L. per Fr. (Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 281. 1955).

The following is what I wrote on the former occasion:

"*Boletus* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 640. 1821.—A re-publication of the Linnean name [*Boletus*] (but ascribed to Dillenius) independently of Fries's and Hooker's and applied exclusive of the boletes, but including only a selection of the polypores. Gray included 17 (British) species. His generic description runs: "Cap sessile, semicircular, attached by the side." Common to Gray's and Linnaeus's genus (of 1753) are, for instance, *Boletus igniarius* L. (*Phellinus* Quél.) and *B. versicolor* L. (*Coriolus* Quél.). A belated example of the application of the first-species rule is the listing of *Boletus caesius* Schrad. as the type species by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 14. 1953)."

I now select as type of *Boletus* L. per S. F. Gray one of Linnaeus's original species also included by Gray, viz. *Boletus igniarius* L. — Not *Boletus* Fr. (1821; Boletaceae). — Typonyms. Compare *Mison* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Scindalma* [Hill] O.K. (1898), and *Pseudofomes* Lázaro (1916).

Bondarzewia Sing. *in* Rev. Mycol. **5**: 4. 1940. — ETYMOLOGY: A. S. Bondartsev (Bondarzew). Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Polyporus montanus* (Quél.) Cost. & Duf. — SCOPE. Introduced with three species.

Boudiera Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 835. 1916; Polipor. Fl. Españ. 147. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: J. L. E. Boudier. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES: (selected): *Polyporus connatus* Weinm., not *Polyporus connatus* Schw. — SCOPE. Introduced with five species, three of which seem to represent members of *Phellinus* Quél. The first species is "*Boudiera connata* (Batr.) Láz." = "*Fomes connatus* Fr.", and *Boudiera scalaria* Lázaro, the last one. — TYPIFICATION. *Boudiera scalaria* was the only species illustrated; it is further a member of the largest taxonomic group (Hymenochaetaceae) included. Donk (*1933:* 247) already listed "*Boudiera* Laz. . . . pr. p. maj." as a synonym of *Ochroporus* J. Schroet. = *Phellinus* Quél. and I would have preferred to select *B. scalaria*, if W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 14) had not once more applied the first-species rule and indicated "*B. connata* (Batr.)", without stating reasons. — HOMONYM: *Boudiera* Cooke (1877; Pezizales). — TYPONYM. If Lázaro correctly interpreted *Polyporus connatus* = *P. populinus* Fr. (of which I am not yet sure), then *Oxyporus* (Bourd. & G.) Donk (1933) is a typonym. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Bresadolia Speg. *in* An. Soc. cient. argentina **16**: 277. 1883 (cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **6**: 123. 1884) — ETYMOLOGY: G. Bresadola. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species : *Bresadolia paradoxa* Speg.—This species has been regarded as an abnormal form of *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. in accordance with Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **14**: 222. 1916); on the other hand Lloyd (Mycol. Writ. **7**: 1191. 1923) thought it to be an autonomous species. — TYPONYM. If one accepts Bresadola's conclusion, *Ceriomyces* Quél. (1886) becomes a typonym. — STATUS. If considered to be based on a monstrosity, *Bresadolia* would be a nomen monstrositatis and hence impriorable.

Buglossus Wahlenb. *per* Wahlenb., Fl. suec. **2**: 961. 1826. — ETYMOLOGY: βούγλωσσος, ox-tongued. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Buglossus quercinus* Wahlenb. per Wahlenb. = *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Buglossus* Wahlenb., Fl. upsal. 459. 1820. — TYPONYMS: *Agaricosuillus* Haller (1742; pre-Linnean name), *Fistulina* Bull. per Fr. (1821), and *Hydrodrys* Pers. per Pers. (1825).

Bulliardia Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 839. 1916; Polipor. Fl. Españ. 151. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: J. B. F., called Pierre, Bulliard. Gender: f. — TYPE

SPECIES (selected): "*Bulliardia unicolor* (Schaeff.) Láz." = *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr. (presumably). — SCOPE. Based on six species. The first one was identified with "*Daedalea unicolor* Fr." — TYPIFICATION. The first species was considered type by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 92; *1953:* 15) and Imazeki (*1943:* 40). — HOMONYMS: *Bulliarda* Neck.[13] (1790; "*Bulliardia*": Wittst., 1856; Annonaceae). — *Bulliarda* DC. (1801; Crassulaceae). — *Bullardia* Jungh. (1830; "*Bulliardia*": Endl. 1841, Wittst. 1856; "*Bulliarda* 'Jungh.' Endl.": Pfeiffer 1873; Melanogastraceae, Gastromycetes; nomen rejiciendum). The latter name ("Nomen feci a Bullardo, viro de fungis meritissimo") was apparently written without an 'i' in error, and, therefore, may be regarded as an orthographically different homonym. — TYPONYMS: If one accepts that Lázaro determined his first species correctly, then *Cerrena* S. F. Gray (1821), *Sistotrema* Pers. per Nocca & Balbis (1821; preoccupied), and *Phyllodontia* P. Karst. (1883) are typonyms. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonyms.

Caloporia P. Karst., Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 2: 23. 1893 [*1892*] *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **54**: 177. 1894). — ETYMOLOGY: καλός, beautiful; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Polyporus incarnatus* (Pers.) per Fr. sensu P. Karst.—See under *Caloporus* P. Karst. for the interpretation of this fungus. — SCOPE. Two species were included: "*C. violacea* (Fr.) Karst." and "*C. incarnata* (Fr.) Karst." — BASINYM: *Caloporus* P. Karst. (1881), q.v.—When first outlined, the taxon was called *Caloporus* P. Karst. and consisted of one species, *Polyporus incarnatus* sensu P. Karst. After its introduction, Karsten suppressed it for some years to re-introduce it again under the somewhat changed name of *Caloporia*, now with the two species mentioned above. He cited his earlier name as a synonym and I feel obliged to consider *Caloporia* a mere isonym. — TYPIFICATION. Because *Caloporia* is an isonym rather than a new name for a new group, the type species of the basinym, *Polyporus incarnatus* sensu P. Karst., is also assigned to it. I cannot follow W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 92; *1953:* 16), who considered the genus based on "*Polyporus violaceus* Fr." This would mean that *Caloporia* P. Karst. and *Caloporus* P. Karst. were different taxa, a conclusion that Cooke omitted to substantiate. — REMARK. The reasons for altering the name *Caloporus* into *Caloporia* are obscure. — STATUS. *Caloporia* may be taken to represent merely a variant spelling of *Caloporus* P. Karst. rather than a homonym; see under *Caloporus* P. Karst. (non Quél.).

Caloporus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 18. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: καλός, beautiful; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): "*C*[*aloporus*] *incarnatus* (Alb. et Schw.)" = *Polyporus incarnatus* (Pers.) per Fr. sensu P. Karst.—The identity of the species Karsten had in mind has not yet been clearly established. When publishing the generic name, no description of this species was given, but it should apparently be interpreted in the light of the description

[13] Necker's names for his 'species naturales' (which form part of his 'genera') are not to be taken as validly published. This conclusion was recently confirmed at the Congress at Montreal. Cf. also Dandy & Ross (*in* Taxon **7**: 261–262. 1958).

he published in the following year (Karsten *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **9**: 62. 1882); no microscopic details were given. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that when an emended description of the species was published under the name *Physisporinus incarnatus* "(Alb. et Schw.) Gill.", Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 315. 1889) apparently mixed up two different fungi, for still later (Karsten, Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 2: 23. 1893; *in* Hedwigia **35**: 44. 1896) he divided his conception of 1889 into *Caloporia violacea* (Fr.) P. Karst. and *C. incarnata* (Pers. per Fr.) P. Karst. — Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 106, 107. 1900) identified *Polyporus incarnatus* sensu P. Karst. with *Merulius ravenelii* Berk., which, as understood by Patouillard, included the fungus now usually called *Poria taxicola* (Pers.) Bres. (*Polyporus haematodes* Rostk.). And compare Burt (*in* Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn **4**: 333. 1917: "[*Merulius ravenelii*] strikingly resembles *Polyporus haematodes* Rostk. [= *Polyporus incarnatus* Karst.] as received from Romell . . .", but he thought these European specimens sufficiently different. — Donk (*1933:* 143) suggested that the type species was "*Leptoporus erubescens* (Fr.)" of Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 542. 1928 [= *Leptoporus mollis* Pers. per Fr.) Pilát sensu Pilát *in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 174. 1937] in resupinate condition. A study of the material available in Karsten's herbarium should be made before the question is considered to be settled. — VALID PUBLICATION. *Caloporus* was published in an enumeration of the Finnish genera of Polyporaceae, the diagnostic features being given in a key: "Contextus coloratus. / Contextus subgilvus, cinnabarinus vel incarnatus. / Pileus fere nullus. Resupinatus." There is not the slightest reason to agree with W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 91), who stated that *Caloporus* was published as a nomen nudum. — REMARK. The following year Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: 57. 1882) failed to maintain the name; its only species was included in *Physisporus* Chev.; this again happened some years later (Karsten *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 315. 1889). — ISONYM (variant spelling): *Caloporia* P. Karst. (1893), q.v.—Several years after the introduction of *Caloporus*, the genus re-appeared, but now as *Caloporia*, with a short description differentiating it from *Physisporus*. No reason for the alteration in the name was indicated, but it might well be argued that *Caloporia* is a mere isonym of *Caloporus* P. Karst. If considered a name change it may be valued as an orthographically different homonym (variant spelling), the two names having the same type species; Arts. 64 2) and 75 might be invoked to support this conclusion. — HOMONYM: *Caloporus* Quél. (1886; 'Polyporaceae'). — TYPONYM. Compare *Merulioporia* Bond. & Sing. (1943; preoccupied; 'Meruliaceae') and *Leptoporus* Quél. (1886), q.v.

Caloporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 164. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: καλός, beautiful; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus ovinus* (Schaeff.) per Fr. — SCOPE. This genus corresponds exactly to *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Carnosi* Fr. (Epicr. 428. 1838; Hym. europ. 523. 1874), although this latter name was not mentioned by Quélet. He only changed the rank of the group, not its contents. Six species were treated, the first being *Polyporus subsquamosus* (L.) per Fr., and one of the others *Polyporus ovinus* (inclusive of *Boletus albidus* Pers., type species

of *Albatrellus* S. F. Gray, q.v.). — TYPIFICATION. Since *Caloporus* is merely a new name for a pre-existing group raised in rank, it may be treated as an isonym of *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Carnosi*. The type species of the latter name should also be chosen for the present generic one. This focuses our attention on *Polyporus ovinus*, considered type species of the sectional name by Fries (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 48. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 32) when he called the very same group stirps "*Polypori ovini*" ("Spec. 1–10 in Syn. Hymen. [= Epicr.]"). Accordingly, *P. ovinus* is here selected also for *Caloporus*. — Murrill (*1903:* 94, 98; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 482. 1905), who was apparently the first to indicate a type species, considered *Polyporus subsquamosus* as such, and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 16) so listed it. — HOMONYM: *Caloporus* P. Karst. (1881; 'Polyporaceae'), q.v. — TYPONYMS: *Albatrellus* S. F. Gray (1821), *Ovinus* (Lloyd) Torrend (1920). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Campbellia Cooke & Mass.—Boletaceae (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 283. 1955).

Cariolus.—See *Coriolus*.

Cartilosoma Kotlaba & Pouz. in Česká Mykol. **12**: 101, 103. 1958. — ETYMOLOGY: cartilago, cartilage; σῶμα, body. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Trametes subsinuosa* Bres.

Cellularia Bull. *per* Corda, Anl. Stud. Mycol. cvii, 194. 1842. — ETYMOLOGY: cellula, cell of honeycomb. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cellularia cyathiformis* Bull.—Bulliard (Hist. Champ. **1**: 373. 1809 made it a synonym of *Agaricus coriaceus* Bull. = *Lenzites betulina* (L. per Fr.) Fr.; this looks a very bold guess to me. In addition to the latter species, Murrill (*1903:* 88 thought of *Polyporus versicolor* (L.) per Fr. — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Cellularia* Bull., Herb. France *pl. 414*. 1788.—Introduced for a single species, the one mentioned above. — VALID REPUBLICATION. Corda only knew the genus from Bulliard's work; he accepted the name and supplied a description and figures adapted from the French author. — REMARK. *Cellularia* was taken up, evidently independently of Corda, by O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 451. 1898]. He considered it the correct name for *Lenzites* Fr. because he accepted the identity of *C. cyathiformis* with *Lenzites betulina*. If 'Cellularia Bull. per O.K.' were to be taken as a distinct name, it must be considered validly published by a reference to Bulliard's pre-Friesian description; the type would then be Bulliard's fungus and it would be incorrect to state without comment that this generic name was based on "*Agaricus betulinus* L." as was done by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 92; *1953:* 17). — TYPONYMS. Depending on one's attitude in relation to the identity of Bulliard's species, *Cellularia* might be considered a typonym either of both *Lenzites* Fr. (1835) and *Leucolenzites* R. Falck (1909), both based on *Lenzites betulina*; or of *Hansenia* P. Karst. (1879; preoccupied) and *Coriolus* Quél. (1886), both typifiable by *Polyporus versicolor*. — STATUS. If not considered a nomen dubium, perhaps impriorable as a nomen monstrositatis.

Ceraporus—See *Ceriporia*.

Ceratophora Humb. *per* Corda, Ic. Fung. **5**: 25. 1842; Anl. Stud. Mycol. 100. 1842. — ETYMOLOGY: κέρας, horn; -φόρος, -bearer. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES only original species: *Ceratophora fribergensis* Humb.—This is now generally regarded as an abnormal form of *Polyporus odoratus* (Wulf.) per Fr. = *Trametes odorata* (Wulf. per Fr. Fr.,[14] in agreement with Fries's early opinion (Syst. mycol. **1**: 373. 1821). — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Ceratophora* Humb., Fl. friberg. Spec. 112. 1793.—Introduced for the one species mentioned above. — SCOPE. It should be noted that Corda's generic description is not merely based on von Humboldt's previous work. "Wir sahen [*Ceratophora*] einmal aus den tiefsten Läufen (13. und 14.) von Przibram, und erkannten gleich die treffliche Humboldt'sche Darstellung als wahr." — REMARK. The name was taken up again, independently of Corda, by Bondartsev & Singer (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 54. 1941) for *Trametes odorata* and a second species. They did not validly publish "*Ceratophora* Humb." for a second time after 1821 for the normal and perfect condition of the original fungus (type species, "*C. odorata* (Wulf.) B.-S."): no Latin, only a German, description; in any case their name would be impriorable on account of *Ceratophora* Humb. per Corda, exclusively based on the subterranean, imperfect condition, and a still earlier homonym. Later Singer (*1944:* 67) dropped the name (substituting *Osmoporus* Sing. for it when he regarded Humboldt's genus as based on abnormal forms and, therefore, as impriorable. — HOMONYM: *Ceratophora* Pant. (1889; Biddulphiaceae, Bacillariophyta). — *Ceratophorum* Sacc. (1882; Moniliales) should not be considered a homonym. — TYPONYMS. If the identity of von Humboldt's fungus is indeed as suspected, *Anisomyces* Pilát (1936; not validly published and preoccupied) and *Osmoporus* Sing. (1944), based on the normal condition, are typonyms. Compare also *Ceriomyces* Corda (1837; not *Ceriomyces* Murrill). — STATUS. Impriorable as a nomen monstrositatis; and in addition of a restricted priorability as a nomen anamorphosis.

Ceriomyces Batt., Fung. Agri arim. Hist. 62 *pl. 24 f. A.* 1755 (pre-Linnean & non-binary name).—This is the (monoverbal) specific name given to what we now call *Polyporus tuberaster* (Jacq.) per Fr., the species with fruit-bodies sprouting from the well-known Italian 'fungus stones' and type species of *Tuberaster* Boccone (1697; pre-Linnean name) and *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. (1821). — Moreover, the word 'Ceriomyces' entered into the names of nine species forming together the whole of Battarra's class XVI. The first of these species, *Ceriomyces crassus* Batt. (op. cit., p. 62 *pl. 29 fs. A, B*) was regarded as the nomenclatorial type species of the 'generic name' *Ceriomyces* by Murrill (*in* Mycologia **1**: 140. 1909), who took up '*Ceriomyces*' as the generic name for a genus of Boleti. If Battarra's 'name' is to be typified at all, it should be by the species bearing the specific name *Ceriomyces*, which is *Polyporus*

[14] According to Hennings (*in* Hedwigia **40**: 136. 1901) von Humboldt's original specimen was still in existence in the Botanical Museum at Berlin in 1901.

tuberaster. However, that species was passed by Murrill because its name was 'non-binomial': "[Battarra's] first binomial species listed is *C. crassus* Battarr. . . ."— Murrill (*in* J. Mycol. **9**: 87. 1903). This is a misconception: *Ceriomyces crassus* is a biverbal name, but certainly not a binomial or binary one, and *Ceriomyces*, as used by Battarra, is not a generic name: Battarra's nomenclatural system is widely different from de Tournefort's and should be completely left out of consideration even if the starting-point date for fungi had remained 1753. — The above remarks were already made on a previous occasion (Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 283. 1955).

Ceriomyces Corda *in* Sturm, Deutschl. Fl., Pilze **3**: 133. 1837. — ETYMOLOGY: κηρίον, honeycomb; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Ceriomyces fischeri* Corda.—See below. — REMARK. Clements & Shear (*1931*: 348) ignored the only original species and suggested as type species *Ceriomyces albus* (Corda) Sacc., the type species of *Ptychogaster* Corda. — HOMONYM: *Ceriomyces* Murrill (1909; Boletaceae). — STATUS. As the identity of the type material has not yet been satisfactorily established, it would seem advisable to consider *Ceriomyces* Corda a nomen dubium, and thus safeguard *Ptychogaster* Corda (1838.; the two genera are now often combined and treated as a genus of imperfect fungi (chlamydosporic states), which is indiscriminately called *Ceriomyces* or *Ptychogaster*. *Ceriomyces fischeri* is sometimes accepted as being an abnormal (and, perhaps, chlamydosporic?) state of a polypore, the identity of which is still uncertain. — Pilát (*in* Ann. Acad. tchécosl. Agric. **2**: 481. 1927) listed it as a synonym of *Trametes odorata*.[15] If he is correct, *C. fischeri* might not after all be a chlamydosporic state, but rather an abnormal growth form and the generic name would be impriorable (nomen monstrositatis). — The inclusion of the species in the same genus with *Ptychogaster albus* is rather the expression of the belief that it, too, like the latter, is an imperfect spore state. If this were true, *Ceriomyces* would be a nomen anamorphosis and as such of a restricted priorability.

Ceraporia.—See *Ceriporia*.
Ceraporus.—See *Ceriporia*.

Cerioporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 167. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: κηρίον, honeycomb; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. — SCOPE. This genus equals the first part of *Polyporus* trib. *Pleuropus* sect. *Lenti* Fr. (Epicr. 438. 1838; Hym. europ. 532. 1874 = *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori melanopodis* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Sci. upsal. III **1**: 50. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 34). It would seem that Quélet acted upon a suggestion made by Fries (Nov. Symb., l.c.): "Facile in duas stirpes dispescitur, alteram pileo magis lento, poris demum majoribus

[15] In this case *Ceriomyces* Corda would be a typonym of *Ceratophora* Humb. per Corda (1842; nomen monstrositatis vel anamorphosis), *Anisomyces* Pilát (1936; not validly published and preoccupied), and *Osmoporus* Sing. (1944).

angulatis s. platyporos (*P. squamosus*, *Boucheanus* cfr. *Favol.*, *Michelii*, . . .); alteram, pileo lignoso-rigente, poris mediis (. . .) l. minutis (. . . *P. melanopus*, . . .)." The group, containing the type species of Fries's stirps name ('*Polypori melanopodis*'), went into the formation of *Leucoporus*, q.v. Quélet treated six species, the first of which is *Polyporus squamosus*. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, *Polyporus squamosus*, in 1903 incorrectly identified with *Boletus caudicinus* Scop., was indicated as type by Murrill (*1903:* 95, 98; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 484. 1905); and accepted by van Overeem (*in* Ic. Fung. malay. H. 7: 3. 1924), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 92, "based on *Boletus caudicinus* Scop."; *1953:* 18), and Imazeki (*1943:* 40). — The 'residue-method' would lead to a species not originally included by Fries and also a very rare and as yet imperfectly understood one, *Polyporus hirtus* Quél. [*non P. hirtus* (P. Beauv.) per Fr. 1821], and its application is rejected in this instance for that reason. Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 137. 1887) in the year following the publication of *Cerioporus*, transferred the bulk of the species to his new genus *Melanopus*, inclusive of *Polyporus squamosus*, and retained in *Cerioporus* as "Espèces principales: *C. hirtus* et quelques autres." — TYPONYMS. The type species of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr., *P. tuberaster* (Jacq.) per Fr., is close to, if specifically distinct from, *Polyporus squamosus*; and compare *Tuberaster* Boccone and *Ceriomyces* Batt.; and also *Bresadolia* Speg.

Ceriporia Donk, Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2**: 170. 1933 ("*Ceraporia*"). — ETYMOLOGY: cera, wax; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Poria viridans* (Berk. & Br.) Cooke. — SCOPE: *Poria* sect. *Chrooporae* group * of Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 661. 1928). — VARIANT SPELLINGS: The more correct spelling of the name is *Ceriporia*. — "*Ceraporus*"; Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 50. 1941; Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66. 1944.

Cerrena S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 649. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: cerrena, an Italian fungus name. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Sistotrema cinereum* Pers. = *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr. — REMARKS. It looks as if Gray's genus equals Persoon's *Sistotrema* sect. **Pileo dimidiato (Syn. Fung. 551. 1801). His description runs: "Stem distinct; cap semicircular", which conflicts as to the stem with Gray's only (British) species, as well as with Persoon's section. — Gray ascribed the generic name to Micheli. That author (Micheli, Nov. Pl. Gen. 122. 1729) mentioned the Italian fungus name cerrena under his *Agaricum* Ordo VII species 2 ("Gelone, Cardela, e Cerrena"). This species seems to have been correctly identified by Vittadini (Descr. Funghi mang. 25. 1835) with *Agaricus ostreatus* Jacq., the selected type species of *Pleurotus* (Fr.) Kumm. — TYPONYMS: *Phyllodontia* P. Karst. (1883) and *Bulliardia* Lázaro (1916).

Cerrenella Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 361. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Cerrena*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Irpex tabacinus* Berk. & C. apud Berk.—This was identified by Murrill (*in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 73. 1908) with *Daedalea ravenelii* Berk. — SCOPE. Based on two species.

Chaetoporellus Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66, 67. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 37, 165. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Chaetoporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Poria latitans* Bourd. & G.— Recently Lowe (*in* Lloydia **21**: 101, 108. 1959) identified this species with *Poria versipora* (Romell) Baxter, stating, "allantoid spores as described by Bourd. & Galz. almost certainly in error". If he is correct this would mean that both the names *Poria latitans* and *Chaetoporellus* might be nomina confusa. — PROTONYM: *Chaetoporellus* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 50. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. Three species were mentioned. — SCOPE. In 1944 only the type species was listed. — TYPONYM. *Poria versipora* is conspecific with the type of *Schizopora* Velen. — STATUS. A nomen confusum?

Chaetoporus P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **29**: 148. 1890; Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 2: 25. 1893 [= *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **54**: 179. 1894]. — ETYMOLOGY: χαίτη, hair; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Chaetoporus tenuis* P. Karst. = *Poria eupora* (P. Karst). Cooke — REMARKS. Lowe (*in* Mycologia **48**: 115. 1956) states that the type of "*Physisporus tener*, Rev. Myc. **12**: 128. 1890" agrees perfectly with *Poria corticola* (Fries) Cooke; that the species has been placed in synomymy with *Poria eupora* (Karst.) Cooke by Romell and Donk; and that it was made the type of a new genus *Chaetoporus* by Karsten the same year. Obviously Lowe mixed up two completely different species, viz. (i) *Physisporus tener* Hariot & P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **12**: 128. 1890 and (ii) *Chaetoporus tenuis* P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **29**: 148. 1890 with "*Physiporus tenuis* Karst. in Rev. myc. 1890" cited in synomymy. This latter name is not to be found in the "Revue mycologique" of 1890, neither is there any species described answering to the description of *Chaetoporus tenuis*. Some error crept in and even if it were possible to prove that Karsten referred to *Physisporus tener* Hariot & P. Karst., this would not alter the fact that the generic name *Chaetoporus* is based on *Chaetoporus tenuis* as described by Karsten in "Hedwigia", a quite different species from *Poria corticola*. Moreover, it may be pointed out that *Chaetoporus tenuis* was apparently published at an earlier date ("Mai u. Juni") than *Physiporus tener* ("1er juillet"). A specimen (which I considered part of the type in 1932) at Uppsala, and which shows by a note on the envelope that Karsten himself suspected the identity, was identified by Romell [*in* Ark. Bot. **11** (3): 12. 1911] and Donk (*1933:* 217) with *Poria eupora*. In any case, Karsten's description by itself leaves no doubt about the identity of his species. — Romell [*in* Bih. K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl. (Afd. III) **26** (16): 14. 1901] took up the generic name *Chaetoporus* to apply it to the setae-bearing polypores. This use is apparently based on a confusion of *Chaetoporus tenuis* with *Fomes tenuis* P. Karst., still another quite different species. Afterwards Romell [*in* Ark. Bot. **11** (3): 12. 1911] referred *Chaetoporus tenuis* correctly to *Polyporus euporus* P. Karst.

Choriphyllum Velen., České Houby 689. 1922. — ETYMOLOGY: χωρίς, separately; φύλλον, leaf. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Daedalea*

fusca Velen.—According to Pilát [*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 478 (Ind.). 1942] this is synonymous with *Polyporus schweinitzii* Fr. — VALID PUBLICATION. In a note to the description of the new species *Daedalea fusca*, the author remarked: "Fungus magnopere mirabilis revera genus propium representans (*Choriphyllum* Vel.)" (translated from the Czech by Pilát, Velen. Sp. nov. Bas. 261. 1948). Thus the name is to be accepted as validly published by a descriptio generico-specifica as an alternative name. — TYPONYMS. Accepting the identity with *Polyporus schweinitzii*, one has as typonyms *Phaeolus* (Pat.) Pat. (1900), *Romellia* Murrill (1904; preoccupied), and *Spongiosus* (Lloyd) ex Torrend (1920).

Cladodendron Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid. **14**: 863. 1916; Polip. Fl. Espań. 175. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: κλάδος, branch; δένδρον, tree. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus frondosus* (Dicks.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with two species. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, *Polyporus frondosus*, was indicated as type by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 93; *1953:* 20) and accepted by Imazeki (*1943:* 42). — TYPONYMS: *Grifola* S. F. Gray (1821), *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill. (1878; preoccupied), *Polypilus* P. Karst. (1881), and *Cladomeris* Quél. (1886); and compare *Flabellaria* Chev. (1826; not validly published).

Cladomeris Quél.. Ench. Fung. 167. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: κλάδος, branch; μερίς, part or portion. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus frondosus* (Dicks.) per Fr. — SCOPE. This genus exactly equals *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 354. 1821; Epicr. 445. 1838; Hym. europ. 537. 1874), although Fries's name was not mentioned in synonymy. First species, *Polyporus umbellatus* (Pers.) per Fr. — TYPIFICATION. Because *Cladomeris* is nothing but a new name given to an already existing taxon which was merely raised in rank, the type species of *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* (*P. frondosus*) must also be taken up for *Cladomeris* in my opinion; see also under *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill. — Quélet's first species, *Polyporus umbellatus*, which has been identified with *Boletus ramosissimus* Scop., was indicated as type by Murrill (*1903:* 95, 98; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 334. 1904; **32**: 481. 1905), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 92; *1953:* 20), and Imazeki (*1943:* 42). — SYNISONYMS & TYPONYMS: *Merisma* (Fr. Gill. (1878; preoccupied) and *Polypilus* P. Karst. (1881), both rather synisonyms; *Grifola* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Cladodendron* Lázaro (1916); and compare *Flabellaria* Chev. (1826; not validly published).

Cladoporus (Pers.) Chev., Fl. gén. Env. Paris **1**: 260. 1826 ("*Cladosporus*"). — ETYMOLOGY: κλάδος, branch; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cladoporus fulvus* Chev., a name change for *Boletus ramosus* Bull.—An abnormal form of *Polyporus sulphureus* (Bull.) per Fr. — PROTONYMS: *Cladoporus* Pers., Traité Champ. comest. 43. 1818 (translation by Dierbach, Abh. essb. Schwämme 27. 1822).—"La . . . division . . . des Bolétoidées . . . a pour genres: le *Hypodrys* (*Fistulina*, Bull.), les *Polyporus* (*Poria*), le *Cladoporus* (*Bol. ramosus*, Bull. *t. 418*) et les *Boletus* ou *Suillus* de Micheli."—Nothing else. — *Cladoporus* Pers.; Brongn. *in* Dict.

class. Hist. nat. **3**: 461 1823 (nomen nudum).—From the manner of treatment it becomes evident that Brongniart definitely accepted the genus taxonomically, although he merely listed it as "*Cladoporus*, Persoon", without adding anything else. He, thus, gave an implicit reference in the form of an author's citation (cf. Code 1952: Art. 48 and its last Example), but since it does not lead to a previously published description of the taxon as a genus or subdivision of a genus, it has to be regarded as insufficient. The next year Brongniart (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. **33**: 578. 1824; Essai Classif. nat. Champ. 89. 1825) listed *Cladoporus* in parentheses as a synonym of *Polyporus* Mich., Fr. — BASINYM: *Polyporus* sect. *Cladoporus* Pers., Mycol. europ. **2**: 122. 1825.—The only species is *Polyporus ramosus* (Bull.) per Fr. — SCOPE. That of the basinym. — REMARKS. It must be noted that Chevallier captioned his genus as "*Cladosporus* nobis. Non Pers." This 'Non Pers.' is surprising and here taken to be an error, for Chevallier's only species "*C. fulvus* N. (= *Bol. ramosus* Bull.)" is exactly the same as Persoon's. — The author's citation *Cladoporus* "(Pers.) Fr." by Ainsworth & Bisby (Dict. Fungi 59. 1943) appears incorrect. — VARIANT SPELLING. The spelling "Cladosporus" of the text was erroneous and corrected in the index (p. 646) of Chevallier's book, "*Cladosporus*, mieux *Cladoporus*." Gillet (Champ France, Hym. 693. 1878) retained the spelling "*Cladosporus*. Chev." — SYNISONYM: *Polyporus* (Pers.) per S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied), q.v. — TYPONYM: *Laetiporus* Murrill (1904), based on specimens of the normal condition of *Polyporus sulphureus*. — STATUS. A nice example of a nomen monstrositatis and hence impriorable.

Cladosporus.—See *Cladoporus*.

Climacocystis Kotlaba & Pouz. *in* Česká Mykol. **12**: 95, 103. 1958. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Climacodon*; κύστις, bladder. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus borealis* Fr.

Coltricia S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 644. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: coltricione, an Italian fungus name. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Coltricia connata* S. F. Gray, a new name for *Boletus perennis* L. = *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Included were three British species; they are, in this order, *Coltricia connata*, and *Boletus nummularius* Bull. and *B. leptocephalus* Jacq. as described by Persoon (1801). The last two species belong to *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. (*Melanopus* Pat.). — TYPIFICATION. The first species has been repeatedly taken as type: Murrill [*1903:* 91, 98, as "*C. perennis* (L.)"; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 341. 1904; **32**: 363. 1905, as "*Coltricia perennis* (L.) Murr."; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 91. 1908], W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86; *1953:* 23), Imazeki (*1943:* 42), Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 77: 1. 1948, as *Polyporus perennis*), Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 145. 1949), and Bondartsev [*1953:* 43, as *C. perennis* (L.) Murr.]. — REMARKS. Gray ascribed the genus to Micheli, who had no genus of that name, but mentioned the Italian fungus name coltricione under his second species of *Polyporus* Mich. (Nov. Pl. Gen. 130 *pl. 71 f. 2.* 1729), which

represents something quite different from Gray's species. — See also under *Polystictus*. — TYPONYMS: *Polystictus* Fr. (1851), *Pelloporus* Quél. (1886), and *Xanthochrous* Pat. (1897); and compare *Volvopolyporus* Lloyd ex Sacc. & Trott. (1912).

Coltriciella Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 348. 1904; **32**: 363. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Coltricia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus dependens* Berk. & C. apud Berk.

Coriolellus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 481. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Coriolus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Trametes sepium* Berk.

Coriolopsis Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 358. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Coriolus*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Polyporus occidentalis* Klotzsch. — SCOPE. Based on three definitely included species.

Coriolus Quél., Ench. Fung. 175. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: corium, leather. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus versicolor* (L.) per Fr. — SCOPE. The original genus equals *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* C. *Inodermei* sect. *Coriacei* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 367. 1821; Epicr. 476. 1838; Hym. europ. 576. 1874), a name not mentioned in synonymy. First species, *Polyporus lutescens* "Pers." — TYPIFICATION. Fries's section was raised to generic rank unaltered; *Coriolus* is merely a new name for it, necessary by the change of rank. Thus, the type species of Fries's sectional name may well be selected also for *Coriolus*. It is *Polyporus versicolor*, as appears from the denomination *Polystictus* stirps *Coriacea* subtribus *P. versicoloris*, once given to the main group by its author (Fries *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 86. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 70). It was considered type species of *Coriolus* by Donk (*1933:* 180), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 59; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Imazeki (*1943:* 43), and Bondartsev (*1953:* 46). — At first Murrill (*1903:* 98) regarded Quélet's first species, "*Cor. lutescens* (Pers.)", as type, but afterwards changed his mind (reasons stated) and took *Polyporus zonatus* (C. Nees) per Fr. (Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 640. 1906; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 16. 1907); he was followed by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86; *1953:* 25) and Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 75: 1. 1948). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Cariolus*"; Imbach *in* Mitt. Naturf. Ges. Luzern **15**: 55. 1947. — TYPONYMS: *Hansenia* P. Karst. (1879; preoccupied). Compare also *Cellularia* Bull. per Corda (1842).

Cryptoderma Imazeki *in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6: 106. 1943. — ETYMOLOGY: κρυπτός, hidden; δέρμα, skin. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Fomes ribis* (Schum. per Fr.) Gill. — SCOPE. Introduced with 14 species.

Cryptoporus (Peck) Shear *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29**: 450. 1902. — ETYMOLOGY: κρυπτός, hidden; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species):

Polyporus volvatus Peck. — BASINYM: *Polyporus* sect. *Cryptoporus* Peck *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **7**: 104. 1880 (description reproduced by Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **30**: 423. 1903).—Introduced for one new species. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. The generic name has been attributed by several modern authors to H. G. Hubbard (*in* Canad. Ent. **24**: 250. 1892): compare Ames (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **11**: 240. 1913). On the cited place we find, "This fungus kindly determined . . . by Prof. Galloway, is *Cryptoporus* (*Polyporus*) *volvatus*, Peck, var. *obvolutus*, Peck. . . .." Follows a description of the variety. One cannot accept this as the valid publication of the generic name: no generic description, no reference to Peck's sectional name. — Shear validly published the generic name ("*Cryptoporus* gen. nov.", by a full reference to Peck's section, thus, for its only original species.

Cubamyces Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 480. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: the island Cuba; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species definitely included): *Polyporus cubensis* Mont.—For a recent description, see Overholts [*1953:* 144; as *Trametes cubensis* Mont.; Sacc.]. — SCOPE. Introduced for the type species, and another, doubtful, species.

Cyanosporus "McGinty"; Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3**: 436. 1909. — A "McGinty" name and hence not validly published (not definitely accepted by the publishing author): for some general remarks on these names, see Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 205. 1951). Compare:

"Based on *Polyporus caesius* [(Schrader)] Fr. and 'characterized by the blue spores in mass.' Lloyd did not take the proposed new genus seriously, since he did not recognize it in naming specimens of *P. caesius* in his herbarium. Lloyd's name is mentioned by Saccardo (Syll. Fungorum **21**: 282. 1912), but apparently not accepted."—Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 75. 1936).

Cyclomyces Kunze *ex* Fr. *in* Linnaea **5**: 512. 1830; Fr., Syst. mycol. **3** (Ind.): 80. 1832. — ETYMOLOGY: κύκλος, circle; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Cyclomyces fuscus* Kunze ex Fr.: Fr. — PROTONYM: "Based on *C. fuscus* Fr. sent to Fries by Kunze in Sieber crypt. exs. n. 63. The specimen was already named but the publication belongs to Fries."—Murrill (*1903:* 91). — "*Cyclomyces*. Kz. ined. exot.": Reichenb., Consp. Regni veg. 14. 1828.—Nomen nudum. — REMARK. At about the same time as Fries published *Cyclomyces*, this same name was independently published again by Hooker (Bot. Misc. **2**: 150 *pl. 79.* 1831) and Krombholz. Hooker's specimens came from Mauritius ("D. D. Telfair. Bojer") and he remarked that "the name of *Cyclomyces fusca* of Kunze has been given to me for [this species]; but I know not in what work it is published by that appellation; nor whether, as I suspect, it is merely in the MSS. of that author." Generic and specific descriptions were added from "Klotzsch. MSS." and the names *Loxophyllum* Klotzsch and *L. velutinum* Klotzsch mentioned as synonyms. [The descriptions are reproduced *in* Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) II **1**: 188. 1834.]

— Krombholz (Naturgetr. Abb. Beschr. Schwämme **1**: 62, 75. 1831) also had specimens of "Sieber exsic. (*Cycl. fuscus* Kunze)" and he, too, published a genus "*Cyclomyces*, Kunze" with a single species, *Cyclomyces australis* Krombh., thus substituting Kunze's specific epithet by a new one. — TYPONYM. *Loxophyllum* Klotzsch; Hook. (1831; not validly published).

Cyclomycetella Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 422. 1904; **32**: 362. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Cyclomyces*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Polyporus pavonius* (Hook.) Fr. sensu Murrill = *Cyclomyces iodinus* (Mont.) Pat. — SCOPE. Besides the type, a few extra-limital species were casually mentioned. — REMARK. Murrill wrongly identified his type material as *Polyporus pavonius*. Afterwards, after having become aware of his error, he considered *Cyclomycetella* as based on the species covered by the name he misapplied, rather than on the material upon which the genus was actually based, hence the name change *Cycloporellus* Murrill, q.v. This solution of the situation must be rejected, and the ultimate type of the name should be a specimen of *Cyclomyces iodinus:* compare Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 485. 1952). — ISONYM: *Cycloporellus* Murrill (1907), q.v.

Cycloporellus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **34**: 468. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Cycloporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (same as of basinym and by original designation: [*Polyporus pavonius* (Hook.) Fr. sensu Murrill =] *Cyclomyces iodinus* (Mont.) Pat. — BASINYM: *Cyclomycetella* Murrill, q.v. — REMARK. A superfluous name change. This new name was established merely by a reference to *Cyclomycetella* Murrill, q.v. If that latter name is based on the true *Polyporus pavonius* Hook., as Murrill thought, then *Cycloporellus* must be considered as having that very same species as type, rather than *Cyclomyces iodinus*, which he substituted for it.

Cycloporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 423. 1904; **32**: 370. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: κύκλος, circle; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Cyclomyces greenii* Berk.—Gilbertson (*in* Mycologia **46**: 229-232. 1954) reduced this to a variety of *Polyporus montagnei* Fr. apud Mont. — REMARK. It is remarkable that Murrill established the generic name without indicating any relation to a taxon as previously segregated by Patouillard (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **12**: 51. 1896): "nous devrons donc placer les *C*[*yclomyces*] *Greenii* et *C. turbinatus* à la suite de *Pelloporus* dans une section spéciale (*Cycloporus*), soit que l'on considère *Pelloporus* comme genre autonome, soit qu'on ne veuille y voir qu'une série d'un genre beaucoup plus vaste (*Xanthochrous*) comprenant tous les polypores à spores et trames fauves, genre sur lequel nous aurons à revenir ultérieurement." When making up his mind Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 100. 1900) called the taxon *Xanthochrous* sect. *Cycloporus* Pat.

Daedalea Pers. *per* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 331. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: δαιδάλεος, curiously wrought. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Agaricus quercinus* L.

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Daedalea* Pers., Syn. Fung. 499. 1801.—Introduced with four species and one included with doubt; first species, *Agaricus quercinus*. Persoon originally called the genus *Merulius* (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 10. 1958, under *Merulius* Fr.).

SCOPE. Fries kept close to the original circumscription, although the number of the species entered considerably exceeded that of Persoon's. *Agaricus quercinus* is a member of his second group, *Daedalea* trib. *Dimidiatae* Fr.

TYPIFICATION. The hymenophore of *Agaricus quercinus* attracted the attention of the earlier mycologists who compared it with a maze. Persoon (Traité Champ. comest. 97. 1818) considered two of his species the most important: "Le genre *Daedalea* . . .. Je ne citerai ici que les deux espèces vulgaires: la première est le *Daedalea quercina* ou *Agaricus quercinus*, Lin. . . . Le *Daedalea coriacea* (*Agaricus*, Bull. *t. 394*, et *t. 537, f. F.* . . .) est beaucoup moins épais." This second species was transferred by Fries to another genus, *Lenzites* Fr.

On at least two occasions Fries himself made it quite clear which species he considered type of the name *Daedalea*. First, when he revised the classification of the polypores in 1851 (Fries *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 99 = Nov. Symb. 83) he stated about *Daedalea:* "Genus limitatu dificillimus et a *Tramete* vix diversum. Morphosis sinuorum alia, praecique in typica *Daedalea quercina*." Secondly, when he emphatically wanted to protest a remark by Quélet (*in* Bull. Soc. bot. France **23**: 143. 1876), which runs, "[J'ai reconnu] dans le *Daedalea quercina* Fr., un *Lenzites*." [Quélet did not actually make the transfer: this he did in 1886 (Quélet. Ench. Fung. 153), which was the first time that the species was removed from *Daedalea*.] On this occasion Fries (Comm. Quelétii Diss. 2, *in* Bull. Soc. bot. France **24**: 73. 1877) was even very positive about the type species: "*Daedalea quercina* (L.) Fr. est *Daedaleae* generis typus . . ."!

Several modern authors agreed upon the same species: Murrill (*1903:* 89, 98; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 84, 491. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 124–125. 1908; for *Daedalea* Pers.), Donk (*1933:* 195), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 63; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 67), Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res. New Zeal. No. 80: 1, 2. 1948), Singer (*in* Lilloa **22**: 732. 1951), Bondartsev (*1953:* 50), Overholts (*1953:* 118), and others; see for instance Martin (*apud* O. Fidalgo *in* Taxon **7**: 134–135. 1958) and O. Fidalgo (op. cit., pp. 133–139) for a discussion.

Yet attention must be drawn to the fact that, when *Daedalea* was validly republished, Fries divided his second tribus, '*Dimidiatae*', into (i) '*Agaricinae*' with *Daedalea quercina*, etc., and (ii) '*Genuinae*' [!] with *D. palisoti* Fr., *D. confragosa* (Bolt. per Fr., *D. cinerea* (Bull.) per Fr., etc.

Fries's first tribus in 1821, '*Stipitatae*', contains *Daedalea maxima* (Brot.) per Fr. as the first species of the genus; this fungus is now identified with *Polyporus schweinitzii*

Fr., type species of *Phaeolus* (Pat.) Pat. This position would account for the statements on *Daedalea* "Pers. ex Fr.", "based on *D. maxima* Fr. (stipitate section) or *D. Quercina* Fr. (dimidiate section)" by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86), and "Type: *D. maxima* Fr. – stipitate; *D. quercina* Fr. – dimidiate", also by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 29).

That same first tribus of 1821 also included as its second species *Boletus biennis* Bull. [*Daedalea biennis* (Bull.) per Fr.], which was selected by Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 95. 1900), who accepted "*Daedalea biennis* Pers." as type species of *Daedalea* "Pers." It is not one of Persoon's original species. Moreover, it had been excluded from *Daedalea* long before its selection: Persoon (Mycol. europ. **2**: 205. 1825) never admitted it to *Daedalea* and persisted in including it in *Sistotrema* Pers. to which he had already referred it in 1801 (Persoon, Syn. Fung. 550), and Fries (Epicr. 433. 1838) transferred it to *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr., thus showing that he did not regard it as a typical species of *Daedalea*. Recently Patouillard's choice was taken up by Imazeki (*1943:* 44; for English translation of reasons, see Fidalgo, op. cit., p. 135) who indicated "*D. biennis* Bull. ex Fr." for "*Daedalea* Pers. ex Fr." This would make *Daedalea* the correct name for *Abortiporus* Murrill (*Heteroporus* Lázaro emend. Donk).

Finally, Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) suggested *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr. type species of *Cerrena* S. F. Gray 1821) for *Daedalea* "Pers." This is another species not originally included by Persoon.

For the tentative suggestion to select *Daedalea confragosa* (Bolt.) per Fr. (type species of *Daedaleopsis* J. Schroet.), see Rogers (*apud* Fidalgo, op. cit., p. 135–136).

REMARK. The first re-publications of the name *Daedalea* Pers. after, and independently of, Fries's are by Hooker (Fl. scot. **2**: 26. May 1821), with one species, *Daedalea quercina*; by Purton (App. Midl. Fl. 247. 1821); and by S. F. Gray (Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 638. Nov.? 1821) who did not alter Persoon's circumscription: he listed five species inclusive of *D. quercina* (his first).

VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Dädalea*"; Lenz, Nützl. schädl. Schwämme 113. 1840. — "*Dedalaea*"; Barbier *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. Côte-d'Or No. 5: 12. 1911. — "*Dedalea*"; Rafin., Anal. Nat. ou Tabl. Univ. 211. 1815 (nomen); Corda, Ic. Fung. **5**: 43, 83. 1842; Matthieu, Fl. gén. Belg. **2**: 342. 1853; Roum., Crypt. illustr. 70. 1870; etc. — "*Tädalea*"; Pabst, Crypt.-Fl. **2** (Pilze): 55. 1876. — "*Daedalia*": Hasselt *in* Algem. Konst- en Letter-Bode **1824** (II): 231 (nomen); O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **2**: 871. 1891 (as a synonym); Ricker *in* Philipp. J. Sci. **1** (Suppl.): 285. 1906; van der Bijl *in* S. Afr. J. Sci. **18**: 286. 1922. – TYPONYMS: *Agarico-fungus* Haller (1742; pre-Linnean name), *Agarico-suber* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Striglia* Adans. per O.K. (1891; 'Polyporaceae'; preoccupied?), and *Agaricus* Murrill (1905; preoccupied).

Daedaleopsis J. Schroet. *in* Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1): 492. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Daedalea*; ὄψις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Daedalea confragosa* (Bolt.) per Fr. — REMARK. Murrill (*1903:* 96, 98) called the type species "*D. labyrinthiformis* (Bull.)."

Daedalia.—See *Daedalea.*

Daedaloides Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid. **14**: 675. 1916; Polip. Fl. Espań. 114. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Daedalea*; -oides, resembling. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Daedaloides pinicola* Lázaro.—Judging from the description, this species seems synonymous with *Trametes pini* (Brot. per Fr.) Fr. [= *Polyporus pini* (Thore) per Pers.]. — TYPONYM: *Porodaedalea* Murrill (1905).

Dedalaea.—See *Daedalea*.
Dedalea.—See *Daedalea*.

Dendrophagus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 473. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: δένδρον, tree; -φάγος, -eating. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus colossus* Fr. — ISONYM: *Tomophagus* Murrill (1905), q.v. — HOMONYM: *Dendrophagus* Toumey (1900; n.v.; Loranthaceae). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, renamed.

Dendrosarcos Paul.—See under *Agarico-carnis*.

Diacanthodes Sing. *in* Lloydia **8**: 141. 1945. — Etymology: δίς, double; ἀκανθώδης, spiny. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Daedalea philippinensis* Pat.—For this species and genus, see Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 473–482. 1948) and see also under *Bornetina* Mangin & Viala (Deuteromycetes; to be published). — REMARK. Incorrectly listed by W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 31) as *Diacanthodes* "(Pat.)" Sing. with "*Abortiporus subabortivus* Murr." as type.

Dictyopanus Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 137. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: δίκτυον, network; the genus *Panus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus rhipidium* Berk.—This species is now often considered conspecific with *Gloeoporus pusillus* (Pers.) ex Lév. — SCOPE. "*D. Rhippidium* [!] Bk. et *D. subpulverulentus* Bk." — TYPIFICATION. The first species was selected by W. B. Cooke (*1940*: 88, as "*Fomes rhippidium* Berk."; *1539*: 31), Imazeki (*1943*: 46), Singer (*in* Lloydia **8**: 222. 1945), and Dennis (*in* Kew Bull. **1952**: 326). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Dictyophanus*": Ainsw. & Bisby, Dict. Fungi, 2nd Ed., 373. 1945.—A printing error (cf. p. 95).

Dictyophanus.—See *Dictyopanus*.

Dictyoporus Clem.—See *Retiporus*.

Earliella Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 478. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: F. S. Earle. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only definitely included original species): *Earliella cubensis* Murrill.—This is synomymous with *Trametes corrugata* (Pers.) Bres.,[16] according to the author himself (Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 45. 1907).

Echinodontium Ell. & Ev. *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **24**: 49. Feb. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: ἐχῖνος, hedge-hog; ὀδών, -όντος, tooth. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Fomes tinctorius* Ell. & Ev. — PROTONYM: *Echinodontium* J. B. Ellis *apud* Lloyd, Mycol. Notes **1**: 3. 1898 (not definitely accepted by publishing author).—Lloyd remarks under the name *Hydnum tinctorium* (Ell. & Ev.) Lloyd: "It might well be taken as the type of a new genus for which Prof. Ellis suggests the name *Echinodontium*, if this view be accepted, making the name *Echinodontium tinctorium*, E. & E." — TYPONYMS: *Hydnofomes* P. Henn. (March 1900) and *Hydnophysa* Clem. (1909).

Echinotrema Parker-Rh. *in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **38**: 367. 1955. — ETYMOLOGY: ἐχῖνος, hedge-hog; τρῆμα, hole. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Echinotrema clanculare* Parker-Rh.

Elfvingia P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 333. 1889 (German translation of Swedish description *in* Bot. Cbl. **43**: 383. 1890; for English translation, see Humphrey & Leus *in* Philipp. J. Sci. **45**: 485. 1931). — ETYMOLOGY: F. Elfving. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Polyporus applanatus* (Pers. per S. F. Gray) Wallr. — TYPONYM: *Friesia* Lázaro (1916; preoccupied). — REMARK. Murrill (*1903*: 96, 98) called the type species "*E. lipsiensis* (Batsch)".

Elfvingiella Murrill, North. Polyp. 52. 1914. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Elfvingia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Fomes fomentarius* (L. per Fr.) Fr. — TYPONYMS: *Agarico-igniarium* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Pyreium* Paul. (circa 1812; devalidated name), *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. (1849), *Ungulina* Pat. (1900), and compare *Xylopilus* P. Karst. (1882; nomen monstrositatis?).

Elmeria Bres. *in* Hedwigia **51**: 318. 1912 (description reproduced by Humphrey *in* Mycologia **30**: 327. 1938). — ETYMOLOGY: A. D. E. Elmer. Gender: f. — TYPE species selected : *Hexagona cladophora* Berk. (1877). —This species was identified by Humphrey (*in* Mycologia **30**: 327. 1938) with *Panus coriaceus* Berk. & Br. (Oct. 9, 1873; not *P. coriaceus* Berk., May 29, 1872) = *Panus berkeleyi* Sacc. & Cub. apud Sacc. (1887) and with *Hexagona flabelliformis* Berk., the latter name simultaneously

---

[16] Persoon (1826) simultaneously published three names for the species that is now often called *Trametes corrugata* (Pers.) Bres. Fries (Epicr. 469. 1838) listed as synonyms, "*P*[*olyporus*] *corrugatus* (junior), *P. fusco-badius* (adultus) et *P. scabrosus* (exoletus) Pers. in Freyc. Voy. secund. Montagne, qui archetypa examinavit." Of these names, Fries took *P. scabrosus* as the correct one. This makes the two other names incorrect. When Montagne [*in* Bélang., Voy., Bot. **2** (= Bélang. & Bory, Crypt.): 147. 1834] established this synonymy he introduced the superfluous name *Polyporus persoonii* Mont.

published with *H. cladophora* (1877).[17] — SCOPE. Introduced for two species, *Hexagona cladophora* and *Polyporus vespaceus* Pers. — TYPIFICATION. The second species (at least as interpreted by Bresadola) is perhaps the more common one, but the first is definitely the one which best conforms to the generic description and it is here considered type species. Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) already suggested *H. cladophora* as such and it was accepted by Imazeki (*1943:* 47). — W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 88, 93; *1953:* 33) considered *Elmeria* and its isonym *Elmerina* based on *Poria setulosa* P. Henn. It is not at all clear why this non-original species was selected. — HOMONYMS: *Elmera* Rydb. (1905; Saxifragaceae) and *Elmeria* Ridl. (1909; Zingiberaceae). — ISONYM: *Elmerina* Bres. (1912), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonyms and, therefore, renamed.

Elmerina Bres. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **10**: 507. 1912. — ETYMOLOGY: A. D. E. Elmer. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Hexagona cladophora* Berk. — BASINYM: *Elmeria* Bres. (1912), q.v. — REMARK. A name change, the basinym being preoccupied.

Enslinia Fr., Fl. scan. 347. 1835. — ETYMOLOGY: A. Enslen. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species mentioned by name): *Sphaeria pocula* Torrey ex Fr. [Elench. **2**: 60. 1828; Syst. mycol. **3** (Ind.): 171] = *Cyphella pendula* (Schwaeg. ex Fr. = *Polyporus pendulus* (Schwaeg. ex Fr.) J. B. Ellis. — SCOPE & TYPIFICATION. Introduced for "*Sphaeria Pocula* etc."; see also Fries (Summ. Veg. Scand. **2**: 399. 1849). This species has been indicated as type by Murrill (*1903:* 92, 98; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 482. 1905), who cited Fries's work of 1849 (l.c.) as the place of publication, where it is the first species mentioned of three. — REMARK. See also under *Porodisculus*. — HOMONYMS: *Enslenia* Rafin. (1817; Acanthaceae); and *Enslenia* Nutt. (1818; Asclepiadaceae), also spelt "*Enslinia*": Reichenb. (1828), see Rogers (*in* Farlowia **3**: 471. 1949). — TYPONYMS (rather than isonyms): *Porodiscus* Murrill (1905; preoccupied) and *Porodisculus* Murrill (1907). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonyms, reason why Murrill gave it a new name.

Exagona.—See *Hexagona.*

Favaria Rafin.—Boletaceae (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 285. 1955).

Favolaschia (Pat.) Pat. *apud* Pat. & Lagerh. *in* Bull. Herb. Boissier **3**: 54. 1895; P. Henn. *in* Bot. Jb. **22**: 93. 1895. — ETYMOLOGY: favus, honeycomb; the genus *Laschia.* Gender: f.

---

[17] Humphrey uses the incorrect name *Elmerina berkeleyi* (Sacc. & Cub. apud Sacc.) Petch. This combination should be ascribed to Humphrey himself, since Petch merely published it as a provisional name. The correct name has to be selected from the simultaneously published *Hexagona cladophora* and *H. flabelliformis.* In view of the fact that the combination *Elmerina cladophora* (Berk.) Bres. (*in* Hedwigia **53**: 71. 1912) has already been made, I herewith assign *H. flabelliformis* as a synonym to *H. cladophora.*

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Laschia gaillardi* Pat. — BASINYM: *Laschia* sect. *Favolaschia* Pat. *in* J. Bot. (ed. Morot), Paris **1**: 231. 1887.—Mentioned were: "Esp. principales: *L. Gaillardi* Pat., *L. cinnabarina* Bk., *L. pezizoidea* Bk., *L. Auriscalpium* Mtg., etc." Notes on the three other species were appended to the treatment of *L. gaillardii* (p. 228), which was the species most fully described.

VALID PUBLICATION. The generic name is sometimes attributed to Patouillard himself (*apud* Pat. & Lagerh. *in* Bull. Herb. Boissier **3**: 54. 1895), who in that publication described a new species, *Favolaschia saccharina* Pat. (with the remark appended, "Espèce voisine de *F. auriscalpium*"), under the caption *Favolaschia* Pat. (no generic description). This prompted Murrill (*1909:* 97, 99) to admit the generic name as "founded on *F. saccharina* Pat., a single species". Since it was evidently not Patouillard's intention to establish a new genus on that species, stress must be laid on the fact that there is a reference: the author's citation "Pat." is here taken as an implicit bibliographic reference to the description of the infrageneric division *Laschia* sect. *Favolaschia*.

The generic name has also often been attributed to Hennings (*in* Bot. Jb. **22**: 93. 1895). Like Patouillard this author treated it as if it were already validly published in that rank ("*Favolaschia* Pat."); he did not add a description but there is the indication "Pat." which is to be taken as a reference to the basinym. Hennings described three new species and listed *Favolaschia auriscalpium* (Mont.) "P. Henn." — The third author to take up the generic name *Favolaschia* "§ Pat., P. Henn." is O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 475. 1898]. — Some authors ascribe thegeneric name to Patouillard 1900 (see below).

SCOPE. Because the valid publication of the generic name was effected merely by a reference, its original scope became that of the basinym. — Kuntze emended the taxon: "*Laschia* auct. §. *Eulaschia* Sacc. . . . Ich stelle [zu *Favolaschia*] alle *Laschia*-Arten nach Saccardo excl. § *Auriculariella*. . .."

When Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 141. 1900) gave a survey of his group as a genus, he divided it into two sections (which were not given names); examples of the first of these are, "*F. Auriscalpium* (Mtg.), *F. rubra* (Bres.), *F. saccharina* Pat., etc.", and of the second section, "*F. cinnabarina* (B. et C.), *F. Gaillardii* Pat., etc." *Favolaschia saccharina* was the only one illustrated (*f. 68*).

TYPIFICATION. The first species of 1887 (cf. Patouillard, op. cit., pp. 226, 228 *pl. 4 fs. 3–5*), *Laschia gaillardi*, was obviously the central species when the basinym was introduced. There seems to be no reason why it should not be regarded as type of the generic isonym, and it was accordingly selected as such by Singer (*in* Lloydia **8**: 195. 1945; **22**: 732. 1951), Dennis (*in* Kew Bull. **1952**: 328), and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 34), all for *Favolaschia* (Pat.) P. Henn. (1895). And compare Patouillard's own remark: "Toutes les espèces de [*Laschia*] peuvent se grouper autour de quatres types que nous allons examiner successivement. Ce sont: . . . *L. Gaillardi* . . . [pour *Laschia* sect. *Favolaschia* Pat.]" (p. 226). The only illustrated species of 1900 (*Favolaschia saccharina*) owes this somewhat outstanding position rather to the fact that it was an addition to the taxon.

Favolosus.—See *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr.

Favolus (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 76. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: favus, honeycomb. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Favolus hirtus* P. Beauv.[18]

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Favolus* P. Beauv., Fl. Oware **1**: 1. 1805.—This genus was introduced when Palisot de Beauvois described and illustrated *Favolus hirtus* P. Beauv. (For this species, see also under *Hexagona* Pollini per Fr.) At the same time he remarked in a footnote that one of Bulliard's species belonged to the genus and also stated that in addition there were already several species known: two from Asia, one from America. He did not mention them by name, but Bulliard's species is presumably *Boletus favus* L. sensu Bull., afterwards renamed *Trametes gallica* (Fr.) Fr. It has been variously interpreted, for instance, as close to *Favolus hirtus*; as "*Trametes Pini*" = *Daedalea pini* (Brot.) per Fr. by Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **7**: 203–204. 1891); and as a form of, or a species close to, *Trametes hispida* Bagl., compare Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 962. 1928). In subsequent fascicules of his work, Palisot described two more species, *Favolus tenuiculus* P. Beauv. and *F. glaber* P. Beauv., in 1809 and 1819 (?)[19] respectively. The former of these two is not now generally considered as congeneric with the type species; it belongs to *Favolus* Fr. 1828, a genus different from Palisot's which corresponds to *Hexagona* Pollini per Fr. of many modern authors; it does not agree with Palisot's original description (substance, etc.), which runs:

"Substantia coriacea, suberosa, latere sessilis aut subsessilis, subtus plicata: plicis subregularibus, plerumque hexagonis, alveolatim reticulatis, apium favum subtus immitantibus."—Palisot de Beauvois (l.c.).

VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Fries originally (1821) took up the name for a subgenus which he soon afterwards raised to the rank of a genus in an emended circumscription.

Polyporus subgen. *Favolus* (P. Beauv.) per Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 342. 1821. This subgenus,[20] which Fries ascribed to Palisot, included some of Palisot's species, viz. *Favolus hirtus* P. Beauv. (tenth species), *F. tenuiculus* P. Beauv. (sixth species), and *Trametes gallica* (Fr.) Fr. (*Boletus favus* L. sensu Bull.), as well as nine other species (perhaps partly also included by Palisot but not mentioned by him by name), among which are to be found *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. and *Hexagonia mori* Pollini (type species of *Hexagonia* Pollini). Of all these, Fries was only familiar with *P. squamosus*; for the other species he relied on published accounts. Some years later Fries (Elench. **1**: 73. 1828) changed the name of this group into *Polyporus* trib.

---

[18] Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **7**: 204–205. 1891) studied Palisot's type.

[19] For the dates of the "Flore d'Oware et de Bénin en Afrique", see Merrill (*in* Proc. Amer. phil. Soc. **76**: 914 sqq. 1936) and Marshall (*in* Kew Bull. **1951**: 43–49).

[20] Fries treated it as a subgenus and there is no doubt that it should be taken as such; however, in the discussion he called it a "genus".

Favoloidei Fr. apparently because at the same time he gave a new meaning to the name *Favolus*: see *Favolus* Fr. 1828, separately treated below. In 1825 Fries called the genus "*Favolus* P. B." and gave the following description:

"Lamellae tenellae in alveolos hexagonos anastomosantes. Pileus coriaceo-lentus. *Sporidia alba*.

"*Obs.* Genus certe Agaricoideum et lamellosum, quamquam lamellae, *A. involuti* instar, anastomosantes ad Polyporeos transitum indicant. Species lignatiles, fere omnes tropicae. Cum Systema Mycologicum editurus nullam speciem vidissem, *Polyporis*, poris angulatis, subjunxi, a quibus admodam diversae. Sequentes videntur genuinae species." [Follows an enumeration of the species and the remark:] "Forsan species nonnullae ad *Polyporos* referendae, si adsunt dissepimenta crassa etc."—Fries (Syst. Orb. veg. 76. 1825).

The species listed (in 1825) are: (i) with central stipe: "*F. alveolarius*. Bosc (S. M. I. p. 343.)"; (ii) with lateral stipe: "*F. tenuiculus*. P. B. (S. M. I. p. 344.) . . . *F. daedaleus*. Link sub *Mer.* (S. M. I. p. 332) . . . *F. extratropicus*. *Merul. alveol.* Dec. (S. M. I. p. 322)"; and (iii) with sessile pileus: "? *F. reticulatus*. Kunth . . . sub *Bol.* . . .? *F. tenuis*. Kunth . . . sub *Bol.* . . . *F. hirtus*. P. B. . . .? *F. Mori*. (Syst. Myc. I. p. 344.)."

TYPIFICATION. *Favolus hirtus* has been taken as type species of the generic name as published by Palisot, by Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. Mycol. France **7**: 203, 205. 1891), Murrill (*1903:* 93, 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 99. 1905), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 90; *1953:* 34), and others. However, Murrill's statement that the genus "was founded upon a single species, *F. hirtus* Beauv." is not correct, as can be gathered from what has been stated above. — As to *Polyporus* subgen. *Favolus* (P. Beauv.) per Fr. 1821, I agree with Rogers (*in* Farlowia **3**: 447. 1949): "It is submitted that since Fries cited Palisot as the author of the name, the type of the subgenus should be chosen from those Palisot species which Fries included in it—i.e., *F. tenuiculus* (Palis.) ex Fr. and *P. hirtus* (Palis.) ex Fr." Of these two species *P. hirtus* has already been chosen for the devalidated basinym and I consider that species the type also of the subgeneric name and of *Favolus* Fr. 1825 (not 1828). — See also under *Favolus* Fr. 1828.

REMARKS. No misunderstanding should exist as to *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr. 1825 and *Favolus* Fr. 1828 being quite different genera. This question will be explained under the latter name below.

Hariot (op. cit., p. 205) pointed out that Fries had exchanged *Hexagona* for *Favolus* and *Favolus* for *Hexagona*. He thought of correcting the confusion but advised not to do so: "Le remède deviendrait pire que le mal et force est de s'en tenir aux idées admises." Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 99, 355, 471. 1905) decided to perform the necessary nomenclatorial changes. However, the adoption of a later starting-point date for these fungi has restored Fries's *Favolus* of 1828 as a legitimate name.

VARIANT SPELLING: "*favolosus*"; Pers. *in* Gaud. *in* Freyc., Voy., Bot. 170. 1827.— Incidental mention. — HOMONYM: *Favolus* Fl. (1828,; 'Polyporaceae'), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of *Favolus* Fr. 1828.

Favolus Fr., Elench. **1**: 44. 1828. — ETYMOLOGY: favus, honeycomb. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Merulius daedaleus* Link ≡ *Daedalea brasiliensis* Fr. ≡ *Favolus brasiliensis* (Fr.) Fr. [sensu Fr.].

SCOPE. The description of "*Favolus*. (Fries Syst. Orb. Veg. 1. p. 26)" of 1828 runs:

> Lamellae! tenues, in alveolos elongatos hexagonos anastomosantes, cum pileo concreti. Asci distincti, sporidiis albis. Pileus coriaceo-lentus, raro integer, plerumque dimidiatus. Contextus floccosus."—Fries (Elench. **1**: 44. 1828).

The only species treated in 1828 is "*F. Brasiliensis* . . . (S. M. 1. p. 332. *Daedalea.*/) *Merulius Daedaleus* Link.": *Merulius alveolarius* [!] DC. is briefly mentioned in a note to this species. By the reference to *Favolus* P. Beauv. as emended by Fries in 1825 one could argue that all species of that emendation were also automatically included in *Favolus* Fr. 1828, except *Favolus hirtus* P. Beauv. of which Fries (Elench. **1**: 73. 1828; under *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.) remarked at the same time, "*P. hirtus* S. M. 1. p. 345 (. . . *Polypori* generis videntur) . . .." However, from the index to the complete "Systema mycologicum" (pp. 90, 146, 148. 1832) it appears that he definitely admitted only *F. brasiliensis* in 1828. (The four additional species he admitted in the index were all described after 1828.) It also appears that *Favolus hirtus* and *F. tenuiculus* P. Beauv. (two original species of *Favolus* P. Beauv. 1805) were referred to *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. In my opinion, it is evident that when Fries accepted the name *Favolus* in the starting-point book as a generic name, he definitely excluded the type species of *Favolus* P. Beauv., q.v.

REMARK. It seems useful to demonstrate that Fries transformed *Favolus* P. Beauv. into a different genus, *Favolus* Fr. 1828, and succeeded by the grace of our Code in establishing a later homonym which takes precedence over the earlier one, it being published in the starting-point book. The transformation was done in three steps: 1821 (Syst. mycol. **1**: 342. 1821; as *Polyporus* subgen. *Favolus*), 1825 (Syst. Orb. veg. 76. 1825), and 1828 (Elench. **1**: 44. 1828). At first (1821, 1825) *Favolus* became a very inclusive taxon, perhaps rather closely agreeing with Palisot de Beauvois's intentions. (i) In 1825 Fries started to doubt the correctness of including the sessile species, most of which he preceeded by a point of interrogation (but not *F. hirtus!*), thus bringing the stalked species into prominence. (ii) As can be gathered from the description, Fries started in 1825 (Syst. Orb. veg. 76; cf. also p. 211 above) to regard the *Agaricus*- (or *Lentinus*-)like species the most typical ones: "Genus certe Agaricoideum et lamellosum, quamquam, lamellae *A. involuti* instar." It is significant that he emphatically spoke of gills, instead of pores or tubes: "Lamellae tenellae in alveolos hexagonos anastomosantes" (1825) and "Lamellae! tenues . . ." (1828). (iii) Finally, he stated expressly that his species of *Favolus* were different from those of *Polyporus* subgen. *Favolus* (which included Palisot's species as well as *Polyporus squamosus*), "Cum Systema Mycologicum editurus nullam speciem videssem, *Polypori*, poris angulatis, subjunxi, a quibus admodam diversae" (1825), and again (Fries, Stirp. agr. fems. Cont. 3: 58. 1825) in a footnote added to *Polyporus*, tribus II, *P. squamosus*, "*Favoli* tropici, quos Systema Mycologicum editurus non videram,

a *Polyporis* extratropicis poris angulatis majusculis maxime differunt. Hi reliquis *Polyporis* immiscendi sunt; ille vero proprium sistunt inter Agaricinos (Polyporo-Agaricinum), nam alveoli formantes e lamellis tenuissimis anastomosantibus." Thus I think that the following —now often accepted—conclusion is a well supported one: Fries, although making use of an already existing name, did not pay much attention to its original description and when applying it as a generic name, a different generic conception as well as a different set of species were attached to the name in 1828. (*Favolus* P. Beauv. per Fr. 1825 is a transitional stage in this respect.) Supplementary evidence to rule out any doubt concerning this conclusion may now be furnished. Instructive are the following quotations from Fries's "Elenchus", "*Favoli* veri sunt absolute Agaricini; *Polypori* autem favoloidei ab hoc genere neutiquam separari debent" p. 73. under *Polyporus* trib. *Favoloidei*); "Cel. Palisot genus *Favoli* etiam ad *Polyporos* angulatos extendit [sic]; sed quod nomen genericum supervacaneum hoc loco servo, vix ullus aequus improbavit" (p. 44, under *Favolus*). In subsequent publications "*Favolus* P. d. B." is mentioned as a synonym of *Hexagona* Fr.

TYPIFICATION. The preceding remarks were intended to demonstrate conclusively that the answer to the question: What is the type species of *Favolus* Fr. 1828? should be provided without taking into account *Favolus* P. Beauv., *Polyporus* subgen *Favolus* Fr., and *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr. 1825; these names represent a different taxon. Of the species listed in 1825, one already draws the attention: "*F. daedaleus.* Link sub *Mer.* (S. M. 1. p. 332)" (= *Merulius daedaleus* Link = *Daedalea brasiliensis* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 332. 1821). When Fries incorporated it in his "Systema" (1821) he had not seen specimens of this species, but in 1825 (Syst. Orb. veg.) he appears to have referred to it a collection examined by him; this was the only material studied by Fries when he described *Favolus* Fr. 1828. See "Elenchus" (p. 44): "Unicam modo speciem vidi, quam infra describam . . ."; the species was described here under the name of *Favolus brasiliensis* (Fr.) Fr., with *Merulius daedaleus* Link as a synonym.[21] See also Fries (*in* Linnaea **5**: 511. 1830): "De novo hoc genere [*Favolus!*] conferas Elenchum fungorum 1. p. 44. Ad genus illustrandum addo hoc loco iconem unicae tum rite cognitae speciei": here, too, the species in question, which is accompanied by a figure, is *F. brasiliensis*. It was this species that stood foremost in his mind when he established his own genus *Favolus*. For these reasons it was selected as type species by Donk (*1933:* 128–129). Exactly the same conclusion was drawn by the Nomenclature Committee of the British Mycological Society (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **24**: 288. 1940): "[Fries] in effect created a genus *Favolus* of his own, with type *F. brasiliensis*." W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86; *1953:* 34), too, who cited *Favolus* Fr. as published in the "Elenchus," considered it based on that species.

---

[21] Link (*in* Mag. Ges. naturf. Fr. Berl. **3**: 37–38. 1809) based the name on a specimen, "E Brasilia habuit illustr. Com. de Hoffmansegg mecumque communicavit"; while Fries (Elench. **1**: 45. 1828) recorded the species, "Ad truncos in Brasilia. Lund. Dedit Hornemann."

Since for these fungi the "Elenchus" is to be regarded as a volume of the starting-point book, *Favolus* of this work (rather than of S.O.V. 1825) may be accepted as based on *F. brasiliensis*, because the latter species virtually is 'the only original species'.

Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) suggested *Favolus europaeus* Fr. as type species of *Favolus* Fr. 1828, and Overholts (*1953:* 155), of *Favolus* "Beauv. emend. Fries . . . 1828".

Polyporus alveolarius (Bosc) per Fr.[22] was selected by Imazeki [*1943:* 47, for "*Favolus* Fries, Syst. Orb. Veg. 76 (1825)"; *in* Bull. Govt Forest Exp. Sta., Tokyo No. 57: 96. 1952, for *Favolus* "Fries"], perhaps because it was the first species of 1825. In my opinion it is not a true representative of *Favolus* Fr. but belongs to the affinity of *Polyporus arcularius* (Batsch) per Fr.

HOMONYM: *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr. (1825; 'Polyporaceae'), q.v.

Fibuloporia Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 67. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 35, 118. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: fibula, clamp-connection; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Poria mollusca* Pers. sensu Bres. (Bourdot & Galzin, Hym. France 671. 1928). — PROTONYM: *Fibuloporia* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 49. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. — SCOPE. Five species and one included with doubt (1941).

Fistularia.—See *Fistulina*.

Fistulina Bull. *per* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 396. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: fistulina, small pipe. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES ("species unica"): *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr. (*Fisiulina buglossoides* Bull.). — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Fistulina* Bull., Hist. Champ. France 313. 1791.—The only species was previously illustrated by Bulliard (Herb. France *pl. 74.* 1781) as "*Boletus hepaticus* Schaeff." — REMARK. S. F. Gray (Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 648. 1821) ascribed the genus to Persoon, who called it "*Boletus* [sect.] *Fistulina*" (Persoon, Syn. Fung. 549. 1801.) — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Fistulinia*"; Dumortier, Comm. bot. 83. 1822 (nomen). — "*Fistularia*": Link *in* Abh. phys. Kl. Akad. Wiss. Berlin **1824**: 179. 1826 (nomen). — Paulet (Mycétol. 35. Circa 1812) once wrote in error "*tubulina*". — TYPONYMS: *Agarico-suillus* Haller (1742; pre-Linnean name), *Hypodrys* Pers. per Pers. (1825). and *Buglossus* Wahlenb. per Wahlenb. (1826).

Fistulinia.—See *Fistulina*.

Flabellaria Chev., Fl. gén. Env. Paris **1**: 259. 1826.—Chevallier accepted *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 354. 1821) as a section without definitely giving it a name, but the sectional description was followed by, "*Flabellaria* nobis.

[22] Listed by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 34) as "*Favolus alveolaris* [!] Bosc ex Fr."

Merisma. Fries. An novum genus?" Thus "*Flabellaria*" has been listed by some as a (not validly published, provisional) generic name; compare, for instance, Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 39. 1836; as a synonym). — If this were acceptable it must be typified rather as an isonym of *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr., for which see under *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill., that is, by *Polyporus frondosus* (Dicks.) per Fr. The latter is one of Chevallier's species. — Not *Flabellaria* Pers. (1818; not validly published; 'Agaricaceae'). — Several times preoccupied.

Flabellopilus Kotlaba & Pouz. *in* Česká Mykol. **11**: 155. 1957. — ETYMOLOGY: flabellum, fan; πῖλος, cap. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species : *Polyporus giganteus* (Pers.) per Fr. — TYPONYM: *Meripilus* P. Karst. (1882).

Flaviporellus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 485. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Flaviporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus splitgerberi* Mont.

Flaviporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 360. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: flavus, light yellow; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation : *Polyporus rufoflavus* Berk. & C.[23] = *Polyporus braunii* Rab. (type species of *Baeostratoporus* Bond. & Sing.) = *Flaviporus brownei* (Humb. per Pers.) Donk.—For this species see also under *Baeostratoporus*. For recent descriptions of this species under the name *Leptoporus rufoflavus* (Berk. & C.) Pilát, see Wakefield (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **35**: 35. 1952) and Reid (*in* Results norwegian sci. Exp. Tristan da Cunha No. 36–38: 12 *f.* 2. 1955). — SCOPE. Based on two species which, I think, are conspecific. — TYPONYM: *Baeostratoporus* Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. (1944).

Fomes (Fr.) Fr., Summa Veg. Scand. **2**: 319 (footnote), 321. 1849. — ETYMOLOGY: fomes, tinder. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr.

BASINYM: *Polyporus* subgen. *Fomes* Fr., Gen. Hym. 11. 1836.—No species were mentioned and in 1838 (Epicrisis) the name does not appear again.

VALID PUBLICATION. The generic name *Fomes* was for a considerable time ascribed to Gillet (Champ. France, Hym. 682. 1878, as "*Fomes*, Fr.") in agreement with Murrill. Then 'Gillet' has been replaced by 'Kickx' (Fl. crypt. Flandres **2**: 236. 1867): compare Hilborn & Linder (*in* Mycologia **31**: 418. 1939) and W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86).[24] It was overlooked that already Fries himself (l.c.) validly published the generic name:

---

[23] Mentioned by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 35) as *P. "rufoflavens"*.

[24] Kickx's first species is *Polyporus salicinus* (Pers.) per Fr. sensu Fr. ["*F. salicinus* Fr. Summ."], with effuso-reflexed fruit-body, one of his other species, *P. fomentarius*.

"Omnes *Polypori* genuini annui . . . . Ad *Trametem* pertinent omnes species primitus aridae . . .. *Sic haec genera clare definita.* Ab utroque definite quoque different fungi lignoso-suberosi, vere perennes, pileo crusta laccata obductis, *poris stratosis*, stratis a pileo discretis, qui tertium genus (*Fomes*) sistant. Etiam hujus exstant species Mesopodes, Pleuropodes, Merismata, Apodes etc., quae seriem tam a *Polyporis* quam *Trametibus* distinctam sistunt. Mire specierum affinitas illustratur, determinatio sublevatur his tribus generibus."—Fries (Summa Veg. Scand. **2**: 319 footnote. 1849).

There is no doubt, in my opinion, that Fries definitely accepted the genus and that it was validly published by him on this occasion. That he did not want to use it in the text itself had its reasons: "Hoc loco vero Epicriseos ordinem sequor, ut facilius species descriptae reperiantur . . .." All the same he introduced alternative combinations with *Fomes* for the Swedish species.

SCOPE. In the text itself a group was distinguished (p. 321) as *Polyporus* d. *Apus* "****Fomes*. (pr. genus c. n. 18)." The species indicated as number 18, "*P.* s. *Fomes lucidus*. (Leys.)" (p. 319), is the only representative of *Polyporus* a. *Meaopodes* "***Fomes*". From the species listed, the identity of *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* sect. *Fomes* with *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* B. *Placodermei* sect. *Fomentarii* Fr. (Epicr. 473. 1838) becomes evident.

TYPIFICATION. Without any hesitation *Polyporus fomentarius* is here selected. (i) It is the species after which the whole group was named in 1838 "*Fomentarii*". (ii) The resemblance between the generic name '*Fomes*' and the epithet 'fomentarius' is telling. (iii) That species is one of the earliest described and best known examples of the group. (iv) It was given as the most representative example of the residue when Patouillard (Cat. rais. Pl. cell. Tunis. 48. 1897, see quotation under *Ungulina*) emended *Fomes* to include only species with hyaline spores. Karsten (Finl. Basidsv. 133. 1899) so strongly reduced the genus that *P. fomentarius* remained his only (Finnish) species. (v) It has already been repeatedly indicated as type species: for *Fomes* (Fr.) "Gill.", by Donk (*1933:* 205), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 55), and Bondartsev (*1953:* 41); and for *Fomes* (Fr.) "Kickx" by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 35), Singer (*1944:* 66), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 158). Teixeira (*in* Arq. Bot. Est. São Paulo **3**: 165–174. 1958) published an extensive review on the typification of *Fomes* and he, too, concluded that this species had to be accepted as type.

To be rejected are all species with white or pallid context because these were excluded by Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 18. 1881) under the name of *Fomitopsis* P. Karst. previous to any typification. This consideration excludes from competition: *Polyporus marginatus* (Pers.) per Fr., Gillet's first species, indicated for *Fomes* (Fr.) "Gillet" by Murrill [*1903:* 93, 99, as "*F. ungulatus* (Schaeff.) Sacc."; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **30**: 225. 1903; **32**: 490. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 94. 1908] and Overholts (*1953:* 32); and *Polyporus officinalis* (Vill.) per Fr., suggested by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347), for *Fomes* "Fr. 1851".[25]

Another untenable choice was made by Cunningham (*in* Bull., Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 79: 1. 1948; *in* Trans. roy. Soc. New Zeal.

[25] In 1851 Fries (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 47, 59. = Nov. Symb. 31, 43) did not definitely recognize a genus *Fomes:* there he called the taxon *Polyporus* series altera *Fomes.*

82: 895. 1955), who selected *Polyporus igniarius* (L.) per Fr. for *Fomes* "Kickx". In this case, too, the 'residue-method' opposes this selection, because the setae-bearing species, of which *P. igniarius* is one, had been excluded by authors who kept *Fomes* as a distinct genus at the same time. This has been done, for instance, by Romell [*in* Bih. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl. (Afd. III) **26** (16): 18. 1901], who distributed the setae-bearing species over *Chaetoporus* P. Karst. sensu Romell and *Mucronoporus* Ell. & Ev. sensu Romell in a general manner without specifically mentioning *P. igniarius* and not stating the type species of *Fomes*; by Murrill (*in* N. Amer. Flora **9**. 1908, and preceding publications), who specifically excluded *P. igniarius* under *Pyropolyporus* Murrill (an isonym of *Phellinus* Quél.) and maintained *Fomes* with *Polyporus marginatus* Fr. as type; and by Donk (*1933*), who also specifically excluded *P. igniarius*, as a species of *Ochroporus* J. Schroet. (= *Phellinus* Quél.; also including some species devoid of setae and who maintained *Fomes* with *P. fomentarius* as type. Cunningham (l.c., 1955) defended his choice by arguing that stability in nomenclature would be best secured if *Fomes* is retained for species congeneric with *P. igniarius*, because such a taxon is far bigger than what would remain in *Fomes* if *P. fomentarius* is taken to be the type. This argument is hardly tenable because Cunningham defends a genus *Fomes* that is about the same as the one currently called *Phellinus* by most European and Asiatic specialists, who are, moreover, already long familiar with the use of *Fomes* with *P. fomentarius* as type.

ISONYM: *Ungulina* Pat. (1900), q.v. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Phomes*"; Greis *in* Natürl. PflFam., 3. Aufl., **5**a (1): 234, 277, 316, 323. 1943.—Correctly spelt in the index (p. 351). — TYPONYMS: *Agarico-igniarium* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Pyreium* Paul. (circa 1812; devalidated name), *Placodes* Quél. (1886), *Elfvingiella* Murrill (1914), and compare also *Xylopilus* P. Karst. (1882; nomen monstrositatis?).

Fomitella Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 365. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Fomes*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus supinus* Sw. (= *Polyporus supinus* (Sw.) per Fr.—For a recent description, see Overholts (*1953*: 374).

Fomitiporella Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 12. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Fomitiporia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Poria umbrinella* Bres. — SCOPE. Based on nine species. — TYPONYM: *Fuscoporella* Murrill (1907), q.v.

Fomitiporia Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 7. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Fomes*; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Fomitiporia langloisii* Murrill.—This "is allied to *P*[*oria*] *punctata* and may be conspecific with it."—Baxter (*in* Pap. Michigan Acad. Sci. **17**: 435. 1933). Lowe (Polyp. N. Amer., Fomes 56. 1957) considers it a resupinate condition of *Fomes robustus* P. Karst. — SCOPE. Based on 17 species.

Fomitopsis P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 18. Jan. 1, 1881 (nomen nudum); *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6**: 9. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Fomes*; ὄψις,

appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus pinicola* (Sw.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for the species of *Polyporus* sect. *Fomentarii* Fr. (Fries, Hym. europ. 561. 1864) with white or pale-coloured context and of which four occuring in Finland were mentioned. — TYPIFICATION. The first species (Medd. 1881), *Polyporus pinicola*, was indicated by Murrill [*1903:* 94, 99, as "*F. ungulatus* (Batsch)"; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 490. 1905]. The same species was selected by Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 55; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 94; *1953:* 36; as "*Boletus ungulatus* Schaeff."), Imazeki (*1943:* 49), Cunningham [*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 76: 1. 1940; as "*Polyporus marginatus* (Pers.) Fr."], Bondartsev (*1953:* 41), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 157).

Friesia Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid. **14**: 587. 1916; Polip. Fl. Españ. 88. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: E. M. Fries. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus applanatus* (Pers. per S. F. Gray) Wallr. — SCOPE. Introduced with five species. First species, *Polyporus applanatus*; only species figured, *Friesia rubra* Lázaro, which represents *Polyporus pinicola* (Sw.) per Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was indicated as type by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 93; *1953:* 36) without reasons being stated. — HOMONYMS: *Friesia* Spreng. 1818 (Euphorbiaceae), *Friesia* DC. (1824; Elaeocarpaceae; variant spelling, "*Friesea*": Reichenb. 1841), *Friesia* P. Wieselgren (1846; Orchidaceae), and *Friesia* Frič ex Kreuzinger (1929; Cactaceae). — TYPONYM: *Elfvingia* P. Karst. (1889). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonyms.

Fulvifomes Murrill, North. Polyp. 49. 1914. — ETYMOLOGY: fulvus, tawny; the genus *Fomes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Pyropolyporus robiniae* Murrill.—For this species, see Lowe [Polyp. N. Amer., Fomes 22. 1957; as *Fomes robiniae* (Murrill) Sacc. & D. Sacc.] — SCOPE. Introduced with four species.

Funalia Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 95. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: funalis, made of rope. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (of basinym): *Polyporus funalis* Fr. — BASINYM: *Polystictus* stirps *Polysticti funalis* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 78. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 62).—Fries included *Polyporus funalis* and *P. leoninus* Klotzsch, and four other species only briefly mentioned. — SCOPE. Patouillard enumerated *Polyporus mons-veneris* Jungh., *P. leoninus*, and *P. funalis* as examples of typical species, and *P. trichomallus* Berk. & Mont. in a section of its own. — REMARK. Patouillard indicated clearly that his genus is the same as Fries's *Polystictus* stirps *P. funalis*, and I do not doubt that the generic name should be regarded as an isonym of it: he cited in synonymy, "*Polystictus* Fr., Stirps E. *Pol. funalis*, Nov. Symb., p. 78." — TYPIFICATION. The standing of *Polyporus funalis* as type species is so sound that it practically amounts to that of a designated type species. The use of the specific name in the basinym is clear, and its slight modification from 'funalis' into *Funalia* is suggestive enough. I do not hesitate for a moment to select it, and consequently cannot follow Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrrey bot. Cl. **32**: 356. 1905), W. B. Cooke(*1940:*

86; *1953:* 36), and Imazeki (*1943:* 49; "*mons-veberis*"), who took Patouillard's first species, *Polyporus mons-veneris*. This latter species was also selected by Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 62; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Bondartsev (*1953:* 48), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 161). — All three of Patouillard's typical species are now sometimes considered to be conspecific.

[*Fungoides* Tourn., Inst. **1**: 560. 1700. — A name introduced for more or less pyxidate or infundibuliform fungi and also used by Vaillant (Bot. par. 56. 1727) and Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 204. 1729). — Paulet (Icon. Champ. *pl. 185 fs. 1, 2.* 1812–35; see also the present paper under *Agarico-carnis*) made use of *Fungoides* for a species he illustrated as *Fungoides hyosotis* Paul., "la grande oreille de cochon", and accompanied by a reference to the specific description in his "Traité des Champignons" (**2**: 398. 1793). One might argue that this constitutes the valid publication of the generic name '*Fungoides* Paul.', it representing a monotypic genus based on a new species of which the description is replaced by an (admissible) plate. On the other hand, it would not be difficult to contest successfully such an attitude. It was certainly not Paulet's intention to publish such a genus, and we know that he ascribed the generic name correctly to de Tournefort: "[*Peziza*] renferme tous les champignons membraneux de la quatrième classe de Battara [!], le *peziza* des Latins, le *fungoides* de Tournefort . . ." (Paulet, Mycétol. 26. Circa 1812). — The reason for mentioning this case at all is that Paulet's species has been identified with *Polyporus varius* (Pers.) per Fr.; while Léveillé's opinion was that "les figures de Paulet donnent une idée très juste du *Polyporus melanopus*, Pers." The text opposes both views, a fact of which Léveillé was already aware. If one starts thinking of the figure as illustrating one of the large Pezizaceae (Discomycetes), one would, perhaps, as I do now, see in it a representation of some such fungus; this idea becomes almost irresistible if one reads the text carefully.]

Fuscoporella Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 6. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Fuscoporia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Fuscoporella coruscans* Murrill. —According to Lowe (*in* Pap. Michigan Acad. Sci. **39**: 34. 1954) this species is synonymous with *Poria umbrinella* Bres., the type species of *Fomitiporella* Murr. — SCOPE. Introduced for six species. — TYPONYM: *Fomitiporella* Murrill (1907).

Fuscoporia Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 3. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: fuscus, dark; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Boletus ferruginosus* Schrad. sensu Murrill. —If Murrill interpreted this (resupinate) species in the current sense it would be conspecific with *Polyporus ferruginosus* (Schrad.) per Fr. sensu Bres. = *Polyporus macouni* Peck. — SCOPE. Introduced with nine species.

Ganoderma P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 17. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: γάνος, lustre; δέρμα, skin. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Polyporus lucidus* (Leyss.) per Fr. — REMARK. Murrill (*1903:* 94, 99) called the type species "*Ganoderma flabelliforme* (Scop.)."

Gleophyllum.—See *Gloeophyllum.*

Globifomes Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 424. 1904; **32**: 367. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: globus, globe; the genus *Fomes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus graveolens* Schw. — *Polyporus graveolens* (Schw.) Steud.: Fr.

Gloeophyllum P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: x, 79. 1882 ("*Gleophyllum*"). — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, any sticky substance; φύλλον, leaf. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Lenzites sepiaria* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced, for a part of *Lenzites* Fr., with four species, of which the first is *Lenzites sepiaria*. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, *Lenzites sepiaria*, indicated by Murrill (*1903:* 94. 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 602. 1904; **32**: 370. 1905), identified by him with *Agaricus hirsutus* Schaeff., has been accepted as type by subsequent authors: Donk (*1933:* 213), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86; *1953:* 39), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 64; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 67), Imazeki (*1943:* 49), Bondartsev (*1953:* 50), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 170). — ISONYM. *Lenzitina* P. Karst. (1889), q.v., may be regarded as a mere name change. — VARIANT SPELLING. The original spelling has now been abandoned for the more correct one, '*Gloeophyllum*', perhaps first used by Karsten himself (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 337. 1889, as a synonym). — TYPONYMS: *Serda* Adans. (1763; devalidated name) and *Sesia* Adans. per O.K. (1891).

Gloeoporus Mont. *in* de la Sagra, Hist. Cuba **9** (Pl. cell.): 385. 1842; *in* Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) II **17**: 126. 1842.[26] — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, any sticky substance; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Gloeoporus conchoides* Mont.—For a recent description of this species, see Overholts [*1953:* 363; as *Polyporus conchoides* (Mont.) Lloyd]. — REMARK. The suggestion of adopting *Polyporus amorphus* Fr. per Fr. as type species, made by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347), should be rejected. The original species is well known and there is no need for its replacement by a species added to the genus long after its foundation. — VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Glæoporus*": Lindl., Veg. Kingd. 41. 1846. — "*Gleoporus*"; Speg. *in* Bol. Acad. Cienc. Córdoba **9**: 452. 1889; Bres. *in* Hedwigia **35**: 284. 1896.

Gloeothele.—See *Gloiothele.*

Gloiothele Bres. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **18**: 44. 1920. — ETYMOLOGY: γλοιός, any sticky substance; θηλή, nipple. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Poria lamellosa* P. Henn. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Gloeothele*"; Clem. & Shear, Gen. Fungi 346. 1931; etc.

---

[26] As to the dates of publication of the "Plantes cellulaires", see Barnhart (*in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 443. 1916). Possibly the sequence of the two publications here cited should be reserved.

Grammothele Berk. & C. *in* J. Linn. Soc., Lond. (Bot.) **10**: 327. 1868. — ETYMOLOGY: γραμμή, line, written character; θηλή, nipple. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Grammothele lineata* Berk. & C. — SCOPE. Introduced with four species. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, already indicated by Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29**: 442, 447. 1902) and suggested by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 346), was also accepted as type species by Miller (*in* Mycologia **25**: 290. 1933) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 41).

Grifola S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 643. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: grifole, an Italian fungus-name (compare, γρῖφος, anything intricate). Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus frondosus* Dicks.

SCOPE. Gray introduced the genus with six British species; the generic description runs: "Stem lateral; cap semicircular." His first species in *Boletus frondosus*. The other species are in this order: *Grifola platypora* S. F. Gray (= *Boletus platyporus* Pers., a name apparently unintentionally omitted from the synonymy) = *Polyporus squamosus* Huds. per Fr.; *Boletus cristatus* Schaeff. (genus *Scutiger* Paul. per Murrill); *Boletus lucidus* Leyss., Pers. (genus *Ganoderma* P. Karst.); *Boletus badius* Pers. = *Polyporus varius* (Pers.) per Fr.; and *Boletus varius* Pers. (with *B. lateralis* Bolt. as a synonym). The genus thus corresponds to Persoon's *Boletus* group "Pileo dimidiato stipitato: stipite laterali" (Syn. Fung. 520. 1801).

TYPIFICATION. Murrill (*1903:* 91, 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 333. 1904; **32**: 481. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 68. 1907), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 86; *1953:* 41), Imazeki (*1943:* 50), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 155) took the first species as type; and the generic name with this type is now in current use for a radically emended genus. — Certain mycologists who did not accept Gray's book as post-Friesian considered *Grifola* as validly re-published when taken up by Murrill (l.c., 1904) and consequently preferred the name *Polypilus* P. Karst., q.v., for the corresponding genus. This induced Singer (*1941:* 69), after his acceptance of Gray's book as post-Friesian, to propose a different type species to save *Polypilus*, viz. *Grifola platypora*. This would make *Grifola* a synonym of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.

REMARK. Gray ascribed the generic name to Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 119. 1729). However, the latter author had no such generic name but mentioned the Italian name "grifole" under a species of *Agaricum* (Ordo II No. 13); this might represent a species of *Grifola* S. F. Gray emend. Murrill.

TYPONYMS: *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill. (1878; preoccupied), *Polypilus* P. Karst. (1881), *Cladomeris* Quél. (1886), and *Cladodendron* Lázaro (1916); and compare *Flabellaria* Chev. (1826; not validly published).

Hansenia P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 39. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 138. 1880 & Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 640. 1906). — ETYMOLOGY: E. Ch. Hansen. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polystictus versicolor* (L. per Fr.) Fr. — SCOPE. Eighteen species, European as well as extra-

European, were listed as examples. They indicate that the genus exactly equals a combination of *Polystictus* stirps *Coriacea* subtrib. *P. versicoloris* Fr. (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 86. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 70) and *Polystictus* stirps *Coriacea* subtrib. *P. scortei* Fr. (op. cit., p. 88 = Nov. Symb. 72). The first thirteen names listed by Karsten represent in an unaltered order the species described by Fries in the "Novae Symbolae", while the last five examples were cited by name in that work as additional examples under the caption "Subtrib. *P. scortei*". The only original aspect of Karsten's genus is that he decided that it should cover these two subtribus of Fries's and no others. — TYPIFICATION. From the preceding remarks it will be clear why I regard as the only two really eligible species *Polystictus versicolor* and *P. scorteus* Fr., type species of the Friesian groups included; and of these the first one is selected without hesitation for it is the best known and commonest representative in Europe. — The rigid application of the first-species rule resulted in Murrill (*1903*: 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 640. 1906) and W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 42) choosing Karsten's first species, viz. *Polystictus hirsutus* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. — HOMONYMS: *Hansenia* Turcz. (1844; Umbelliferae), *Hansenia* Zopf (1883; Sordariaceae, Ascomycetes),[27] *Hansenia* P. Lindner (1904; Endomycetaceae, Ascomycetes),[28] and *Hansenia* Zikes (1911; Torulopsidaceae, Deuteromycetes).[29] — TYPONYM: *Coriolus* Quél. (1886). And compare *Cellularia* Bull. per Corda (1842). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Hapalopilus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 18. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: ἁπαλός, tender; πῖλος, cap. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Polyporus nidulans* Fr. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Haplopilus*"; Ricker *in* Philipp. J. Sci. **1** (Suppl.): 287. 1906.

Haplopilus.—See *Hapalopilus*.

Haploporus Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66, 68. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 47, 523. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ἁπλόος, simple; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Trametes odora* (Sommerf.: Fr.) Fr. sensu Bond. & Sing. = *Trametes ljubarskyi* Pilát, according to Bondartsev (l.c.). — PROTONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 60. 1941.— Not validly published: no Latin description. Two species were mentioned. — SCOPE. In 1944 only the type species was mentioned.

---

[27] *Hansenia* Zopf *in* Z. Naturw. **56**: 542, 565. 1883.—Although treated as a generic name in some places, *Hansenia* is preceded by the word "Untergattung" on other pages (pp. 559, 565) in the paper in which it was published.

[28] *Hansenia* P. Lindner *in* Jb. VersAnst. Brau. Berl. **7**: 448. 1904 (perhaps valid publication not iron-cast); Klöcker, Gärungsorg., 2. Aufl., 264. 1906.

[29] *Hansenia* Zikes *in* Cbl. Bakteriol. (II. Abt.) **30**: 148. 1911.—It is not quite clear from the original publication whether this was a new name or perhaps rather a misapplication of *Hansenia* P. Lindner.

Hemidiscia Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 575. 1916; Polyp. Fl. Espań. 76. 1917. — Etymology: ἡμί-, half; δίσκος, quoit. Gender: f. — Type species (selected: "*Hemidiscia lactea* (Sow.) Láz.", with "*Polyporus lacteus* Fr." as a synonym. —Lázaro's determinations of even common European species are often unreliable; judging from the description this species might be *Polyporus lacteus* or a closely related form. For that species, see also under *Postia*. — Scope. Introduced with six species which form a remarkable mixture of unrelated forms. — Typification. The first species, *Polyporus lacteus*, was selected by W. B. Cooke (*1940*: 94; *1953*: 43) and accepted by Imazeki (*1943*: 51). — Typonym. Compare *Postia* Fr. (1874).

Henningsia A. Möll. *in* Verh. Ges. dtsch. Naturf. Aerzte, 69. Vers. zu Braunschweig 1897 **2** II: 151. 1897; *in* Bot. Cbl. **72**: 231. 1897 (descriptio generico-specifica). — Etymology: P. C. Hennings. Gender: f. — Type species (only original species: *Henningsia geminella* A. Möll. –According to Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **18**: 69. 1920 this species is the same as *Polyporus brasiliensis* Speg. At an earlier date Bresadola (*in* Hedwigia **35**: 281. 1896) and Rick [*in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **6**: 88. 1907] had considered it identical with *Polystictus rigescens* Cooke. Afterwards Rick [*in* Brotéria Sér. Ci nat.) **4**: 128. 1935] listed *H. geminella* as a synonym of *Polystictus petaliformis* (Berk. & C.) Cooke. — Protonym: *Henningsia* A. Möll. *in* Bot. Mitth. Tropen **8**: 44. 1895.—Nomen nudum. — Remark. This generic name is rarely cited and then considered as validly published by Hennings [*in* Natürl. PflFam. **1** 1**): 188. 1898], Möller's own and valid publication of the name being overlooked.

Henningsomyces O.K.—'Cyphellaceae' (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 212. 1951).

Heterobasidion Bref., Unters. Gesamtgeb. Mykol. **8**: 154. "1889" [1888]. — Etymology: ἕτερος, different; basidium. Gender: m. — Type species (only original species): *Polyporus annosus* Fr. — Variant spelling: "*Heterobasidium*"; Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 113. 1900 (as a synonym); Clem. & Shear, Gen. Fungi 347. 1931 (as a synonym). — Homonym. *Heterobasidium* Mass. (1889; nomen confusum, 'Thelephoraceae') is perhaps a homonym? (different termination but same gender).

Heterobasidium ["Bref."].—See *Heterobasidion*.

Heteroporus Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **15**: 119. 1916; Polipor. Fl. Espań. 211. 1917. — Etymology: ἕτερος, different; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — Type species (selected): *Daedalea biennis* (Bull.) per Fr. — Scope. Introduced with four species of which the first is *Daedalea biennis*. — Typification. The first species was taken as type by Donk (*1933*: 176) and has been subsequently accepted by W. B. Cooke (*1940*: 94; *1953*: 44), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941*: 62), Imazeki (*1943*: 51), and other authors. — Remarks. Lázaro did not indicate that any relation would

exist with *Sistotrema* sect. *Heteroporus* Pers. (Mycol. europ. **2**: 205. 1825). — Lázaro (*in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 498. 1916; Polipor. Fl. Espań. 49. 1917) mentioned a genus '*Pseudopelloporus*' (name only) in his introductory arrangement of the genera he accepted. From his "Erratas advertidas" (1917) it appears that this name has to be replaced by *Heteroporus*. — TYPONYMS. I now regard *Irpicium* Bref. (1912), q.v., as a typonym. *Abortiporus* Murrill (1904), q.v., will be considered by some authors as another one.

Hexagona Pollini ("*Hexagonia*") *per* Fr., Fl. scan. 339. 1835; Gen. Hym. 11. 1836; Epicr. 496. 1838. — ETYMOLOGY: hexagonus, sexangular. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (only original species of devalidated name): *Hexagonia mori* Pollini. — Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **7**: 203. 1891), Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Club **31**: 327. 1904), Saccardo (*in* Fl. ital. crypt., Fungi, Hym. 1060. 1916), and other authors regarded it as synonymous with *Favolus europaeus* Fr. under the latter name or one of its synonyms).[30] Marcucci's opinion that *H. mori* and *Hexagona nitida* Mont. were identical is not acceptable; his fungus was afterwards called *H. marcucciana* Bagl. & De Not. and Fries accepted it as a species close to *Hexagona nitida*.

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Hexagonia* Pollini, Horti veron. Pl. nov. 35. 1816.[31] — Instituted for one species, *Hexagonia mori*.

SCOPE. In 1835 Fries gave only a short generic description; in 1836 he indicated that the genus included 12 species, which, however, were not mentioned by name: the species were fully treated in 1838. First species (1838), *Polyporus wightii* Klotzsch ("*wrightii*"); other species are *Hexagona crinigera* Fr., *Favolus hirtus* P. Beauv. [selected

---

[30] The correct name for this species under *Favolus* appears to be *Favolus mori* (Pollini per Fr.) Fr. Synonymy of two basinyms involved:

Merulius alveolaris DC., Fl. franç. **6**: 43. 1815 (devalidated name). — *Cantharellus alveolaris* (DC.) *per* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 322. 1821. — *Merulius alveolaris* (DC. per Fr.) Pers., Mycol. europ. **2**: 24. 1825. — *Favolus alveolaris* (DC. per Fr.) Quél., Ench. Fung. 185. 1886, not *Favolus alveolarius* (Bosc per Fr.) Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 76. 1825. — *Hexagonia alveolaris* (DC. per Fr.) Hariot *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **7**: 205. 1891 (name not definitely accepted). — *Hexagona alveolaris* (DC. per Fr.) Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 327. 1904. — *Polyporellus alveolaris* (DC. per Fr.) Pilát *in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 83 *f.* 20, *pls.* 33, 34 *f. a.* Nov.–Dec. 1936 & *in* Beih. bot. Cbl. B **56**: 36 *pl.* 3. Dec. 1936 ("*alveolarius*"; not *Polyporellus alveolarius* (Bosc per Fr.) P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 38. 1879. — *Polyporus alveolaris* (DC. per Fr.) Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 58. 1941, not *Polyporus alveolarius* (Bosc) per Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 342. 1821. — *Favolus extratropicus* Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 76. 1825, isonym, validly published by a reference to "*Merul. alveol.* Dec. S.M. 1. p. 322." — *Favolus europaeus* Fr., Epicr. 498. 1838, another isonym.

Hexagonia mori Pollini, Horti veron. Pl. nov. 35 *pl.* 1 *fs.* 2, 3. 1816 (devalidated name). — *Polyporus* (*Favolus*) *mori* Pollini *per* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 344. 1821. — *Boletus mori* (Pollini per Fr.) Pollini, Fl. veron. **3**: 618. 1824. — *Favolus mori* (Pollini per Fr.) Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 76. 1825. — *Hexagona mori* (Pollini per Fr.) Fr., Epicr. 497. 1838.

[31] The title-page of this paper bears the indication: "Insert. in Tom. IX. Diarii Phicic. Med. Ticin." — Compare Persoon, Mycol. europ. **2**: 35. 1825. — W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 44) erroneously substituted 'Beauv.' for 'Pollini' and listed the type species as "*H. alveolaris* DC."

type species of *Favolus* P. Beauv. and *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr., not *Favolus* Fr. 1828], *Polyporus apiarius* Pers., and *Hexagonia mori* [type species of *Hexagonia* Pollini, a species currently referred to *Favolus* Fr. 1828, not *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr. 1825].

TYPIFICATION. As in the case of *Favolus* P. Beauv., Fries adopted a pre-existing name, but then changed the meaning by redefining the characters; however, he never excluded the only original species. If he had correctly applied the two names *Favolus* P. Beauv. and *Hexagonia* Pollini would not have become interchanged.

When Fries took up the name *Hexagona* he not only included Pollini's only original species but also explicitly attributed the genus to "Pollin. pl. nov. p. 35" (Fries, l.c., 1838; in the preliminary accounts of 1835 and 1836 no author's citation is given). Murrill [*1903:* 90, 99; as "*H. alveolaris* (D.C)"; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 325. 1904], therefore, correctly applied Pollini's name when he took *Hexagonia mori* as type. With my present interpretation of the Code as regards typification of revalidated names (Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 245–256. 1957) I also consider it the type of *Hexagona* Pollini per Fr.

"There would seem to be little obligation to recognize *H. mori* as the type, especially since the genus should be written *Hexagona* Fr. 1835." With these words Rogers *in* Farlowia **3**: 448. 1949, expressed a popular opinion currently held before the Stockholm Congress that has led to the selection of type species other than *H. mori* (which, by the way, Fries never excluded). It is evident that Fries's generic description was drawn up from other species, such as *Polyporus hirtus* (P. Beauv.) per Fr. [type species of *Favolus* (P. Beauv. per Fr.) Fr.], *P. wightii*, *Hexagona crinigera*, *Polyporus scutiger* Fr., and others. *Hexagona mori* was unknown to him except by its very insufficient description. ("Haec, sola Europaea, mihi ignota est." —Fries, Epicr. 497. 1838).

Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) suggested *Hexagona crinigera.*

Maire (*in* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3. Aufl., 123. 1935) took *Polyporus apiarius* as type species[32]; apparently it was not known to Fries from first-hand knowledge. The same species was accepted by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 88)[33] and Imazeki (*1943:* 51; *in* Bull. Govt Forest Exp. Sta., Tokyo No. 57: 103. 1952).

Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 187. 1941) selected *Favolus hirtus*, the selected type species of *Favolus* P. Beauv., a species well described and illustrated by its author, but not known to Fries from specimens it would seem.

"If the first species from Fries' first section [1838] be chosen as lectotype, his conception of the genus will be preserved. *Hexagona Wightii* (Kl.) Fr. (non *Wrightii*) is therefore suggested as lectotype; this species is probably identical with *Polyporus*

---

[32] By a confusion of facts I once stated quite erroneously that this species was not among the 'original' ones, that is, Fries's of 1838 (Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 187. 1941).

[33] W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 44) also listed the name as *Hexagona* "Fr. Syst. Mycol. 1: 344. 1821" with *H.* "*apiaris*" as type species.

apiarius Pers., the species suggested as the type [by Maire]."—Nomenclature Committee of the British Mycological Society (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **24**: 289. 1940). Overholts (*1953:* 131) selected the same species for *Hexagona* "Pollini emend. Fries".

Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 61; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66) and Bondartsev (*1953:* 47) chose *Hexagona nitida* Mont., a non-original species, which should be left out of further consideration altogether.

From this survey it appears that four species (in fact the first four species of 1838, all now considered closely related) have been proposed that would preserve Fries's conception; of these *Hexagona crinigera* is the one suggested earliest and *Favolus hirtus*, the historically oldest species. The fact that Fries (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 100. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 84) provided these four species under discussion and a few other ones with the denomination '*Hexagonae hirtae*' ("Trib. I. *H. hirtae* . . . H. l. Epicr. n. 1–4, *H. aculeata* Mont., *H. setigera* Fr. ined. etc.") is to me the decisive factor to suggest *Favolus hirtus* once more, if one wants to maintain the name *Hexagona* with a type other than *Hexagona mori*.

REMARKS. The proposal to conserve *Hexagona* 'Fr. [non Pollini]' against *Scenidium* (Klotzsch) O.K. (1898) has been thought superfluous because *Hexagona* has been considered to stand without conservation; rejection was recommended by the British Nomenclature Committee (l.c.), Donk (l.c.), and Rogers (l.c.); and accepted by the Special Committee for Fungi (*in* Taxon **2**: 29. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45**: 313. 1953). — Already Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **7**: 205. 1891) was fully aware that Fries had misapplied the names *Hexagonia* and *Favolus*, but he shrinked from restoring the names in their original senses and preferred to leave the situation as he found it. It was left to Murrill to apply the names correctly again. — If in the future it should appear correct to typify *Hexagonia* by *H. mori*, it may be thought desirable as yet to conserve the name in Fries's sense, that is, with *Polyporus hirtus* as type, against *Scenidium* (Klotzsch) O.K. (1898), q.v.

VARIANT SPELLINGS. Pollini's original spelling has been used sometimes for the Friesian name: "*Hexagonia* Pollin. Fries"; Mont. *in* de la Sagra, Hist. Cuba **9** (Pl. cell.): 379. 1842, and several later authors. Montagne (op. cit., p. 380) remarked:

"Le nom [*Hexagona*] donné à ce genre par Pollini et adopté par Fries, a dû être légèrement modifié dans sa terminaison, parce qu'il péchait contre cette règle qui s'oppose a l'emploi, comme noms de genres, des mots purement adjectifs."

"Although the omission of the *i* by Fries may have been an unintentional error, as stated in the examples under Art. 70 of the Rules [Amsterdam revision], it would appear desirable to adopt this spelling in order to emphasize that the genus as at present understood is not based on the plant to which Pollini gave the name *Hexagonia*."—Nomenclature Committee (l.c.); and compare also Rogers (*in* Farlowia **4**: 26. 1950). This argument is not valid if *H. mori* is considered type. Murrill's spelling (without *i*) was undoubtedly an unintentional error, perhaps induced by Fries's spelling: he credited Pollini with the variant without *i*. —

"*Exagona*." This form is obviously an error; for instance Spegazzini (*in* An. Soc. cient. argentina **26**: 9. 1888) used it in two specific combinations.

Hexagonia.—See *Hexagona*.

Hirschioporus Donk, Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2**: 168. 1933. — ETYMOLOGY: H. Hirsch; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Polyporus abietinus* (Dicks.) per Fr.[34] — SCOPE. Introduced with two species. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Hirshioporus*"; Imazeki *in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6: 81. 1943 (error, correctly spelt on p. 52).

Hologloea Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 85. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: ὅλος, entire; γλοιός, any sticky substance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Porolaschia micropora* Pat. — SCOPE. "Petit groupe institué pour les *H. micropora* Pat. du Mexique et *H. pezizaeformis* Berk. Curt. (*Laschia*) des îles Bonin . . .."—Patouillard (op. cit., p. 86 . — TYPIFICATION. Singer (*in* Lloydia **8**: 200. 1945) selected the first species. It is also listed as type by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 45).

Hydnochaete Bres.—'Hydnaceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **5**: 96. 1956).

Hydnofomes P. Henn. *in* Bot. Jb. **28**: 267. March 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Hydnum*; the genus *Fomes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Hydnofomes tsugicola* P. Henn. & Shir. apud P. Henn. = *Echinodontium tinctorium* (Ell. & Ev.) Ell. & Ev., according to Banker (*in* Mycologia **5**: 295. 1913). — ISONYM: *Hydnophysa* Clem. (1909 , q.v. — TYPONYM: *Echinodontium* Ell. & Ev. (Feb. 1900).

Hydnophysa Clem., Gen. Fung. 108. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Hydnum* (ὕδνον); φύσις, nature, or φῦσα, bladder? Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Hydnofomes tsugicola* P. Henn. & Shir. apud P. Henn. = *Echinodontium tinctorium* (Ell. & Ev.) Ell. & Ev. — BASINYM: *Hydnofomes* P. Henn. (1900), q.v. — REMARK. A superfluous name change introduced for linguistic reasons for *Hydnofomes* P. Henn., already criticized by Banker (*in* Mycologia **5**: 296. 1913). — TYPONYM: *Echinodontium* Ell. & Ev. (1900).

Hydnoporia Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 3. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Hydnum*; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Sistotrema fuscescens* Schw. = *Sistotrema olivaceum* Schw. =

---

[34] Fries [Syst. mycol. **1**: 355, 518 (index). 1821] gave "Schrank" as the author's citation. Dickson refers to an earlier, anonymous author whose paper was published between two by von Schrank.

Hydnum olivaceum (Schw.) Fr. (Elench. **1**: 134. 1828).—Compare Banker (*in* Mycologia **6**: 233–234. 1914). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Hydroporia*"; Katal. Lunds bot. For. Växtbyte 1950–51: 49.—An unintentional error.

Hydnotrema Link, Handb. Gewächse **3**: 298. 1833. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Hydnum*; τρῆμα, hole. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Sistotrema confluens* Pers. per Fr. — BASINYM: *Sistotrema* Fr. (1821), q.v. — REMARK. Link confined *Sistotrema* Pers. to *Sistotrema cinereum* Pers. [= *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr.], for that time correctly, I think. In fact *Hydnotrema* was a new name for *Sistotrema* Fr. (non Pers.).

Hydroporia.—See *Hydnoporia*.

Hymenogramme Mont. & Berk. *in* Lond. J. Bot. **3**: 329. 1844. — ETYMOLOGY: ὑμήν, membrane; γραμμή, line, written character. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Hymenogramme javensis* Mont. & Berk.—The species has been considered synonymous with *Laschia crustacea* Jungh. (selected type species of *Laschia* Jungh., not *Laschia* Fr., and its isonyms), perhaps on the basis of this remark:

"It is possible that this may be the same species with what Junghuhn has described under the name of *Laschia crustacea*. . . . But even should it be the same it would be necessary to propose a new generic name as that of *Laschia* has been given by Fries to a different fungus. His second species of *Laschia* belongs clearly to some other genus."—Montagne & Berkeley (op. cit., p. 330).

Confirmation about the identity is still wanting; see also under *Laschia* Jungh. — REMARK. Maire (*in* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3. Aufl., 123. 1935) proposed *Hymenogramme* for conservation against *Laschia* Jungh. (preoccupied) and its isonyms *Aschersonia* Endl. (1842; not *Aschersonia* Mont.), q.v., and *Junghuhnia* Corda (1842). The proposal was recommended for rejection by Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 188. 1941) and Rogers (*in* Farlowia **3**: 450. 1949); and compare the Special Committee for Fungi (*in* Taxon **2**: 29. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45**: 313. 1954). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Hymenogramma* B. et Montg.": Léon March., Enum. méth. Mycoph. 202. 1896.

Hypodrys Pers. *per* Pers., Mycol. europ. **2**: 148. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: ὑπό, under: δρῦς, oak. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus hepaticus* Schaeff. — *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr. — PROTONYM & DEVALIDATED NAME. "*Hypodrys*. Solenaud. Consult. medic. Francof. 1596" (n.v.) was cited as the origin of the name. Persoon used it once before when introducing it into the binomial system, substituting it for *Fistulina* Bull., and including *Fistulina buglossoides* Bull. (*Boletus hepaticus*): Traité Champ. comest. 43, 245. 1818 (& Abh. essb. Schwämme 27. 1822, transl. by Dierb.), see quotation in the present paper under *Cladoporus*. — REMARK. Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 459. 1821) once mentioned the name as follows: "BOLETUS abiens in Hydnum = *Fistulina*. / [BOLETUS] abiens in Polyporum =

Hypodrys. / [BOLETUS] abiens in Thelephoram = *Merulius.*" This use (as a nomen nudum) is baffling. — TYPONYMS: *Fistulina* Fr. (1821) and *Buglossus* Wahlenb. per Wahlenb. (1826).

Hypolepia Rafin.—See Deuteromycetes (to be published).

Inoderma P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 39. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 138. 1880). — ETYMOLOGY: ἴς, ἰνός, fibre; δέρμα, skin. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus radiatus* (Sow.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Sixteen examples, including several extra-European ones, were listed; the first is *Polyporus radiatus.* The original genus corresponds rather closely to Fries's *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* C. *Inodermei* sect. *Stuposi* group *contextu colorato (Epicr. 473. 1838; Hym. europ. 564. 1874; "*Stupposi*"). The extra-European species were taken from *Polystictus* stirps *Polysticti stuposi* Fr. (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 79. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 63).[35] — TYPIFICATION. The first species, a well-known European fungus, has been considered type by Murrill (*1903:* 93, 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 362. 1905), Imazeki (*1943:* 52), and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 50). — HOMONYMS: *Inoderma* (Ach.) S. F. Gray (1821; Verrucariaceae, Lichenes); *Inoderma* Kütz. [Alg. Aq. dulc. Dec. 4: 39. 1833; Chlorophyta, or according to Drouet & Daily (*in* Bot. Stud. Butler Univ. **12**: 153. 1956), Diatoms]; and *Inoderma* Berk. (1881; Elaphomycetaceae, Ascomycetes). — Since *Inodermus* Quél. (1886; 'Polyporaceae') has a number of species in common with *Inoderma* P. Karst. and at the same time the two names are very similar, these should be treated as orthographically different homonyms, that is, as mere variant spellings (Art. 75), although the terminations are different. — TYPONYMS: *Inodermus* Quél. (1886), rather a synisonym or variant spelling, and *Mensularia* Lázaro (1916). — STATUS. Imprior-able on account of the earlier homonyms.

Inodermus Quél., Ench. Fung. 173. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: ἴς, ἰνός, fibre; δέρμα, skin. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus radiatus* (Sow.) per Fr. — SCOPE: The genus equals (i) *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* A. *Anodermei* sect. *Spongiosi* Fr. (cf. Fries, Hym. europ. 551. 1874) plus (ii) Fries's *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* C. *Inodermei* sect. *Stupposi* group *Contextu colorato (op. cit., p. 564). First species, *Polyporus hispidus* (Bull.) per Fr. — TYPIFICATION. As in the case of *Inoderma* P. Karst., q.v., Quélet's generic name *Inodermus* is an undisguished isonym (not especially avowed, but nevertheless undeniable, of *Polyporus* C. *Inodermei* Fr., although in an emended circumscription. Such a view necessitates the selection of a species of this section [= *Inodermus* sect. *Stupposi* (Fr.) Quél.] rather than of *Polyporus* sect. *Spongiosi* Fr. [= *Inodermus* sect. *Spongiosi* (Fr.) Quél.]. It will be clear why I prefer *Polyporus radiatus* rather than *P. hispidus.* — The latter species (Quélet's first one) has been considered type by Murrill (*1903:* 95, 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 593. 1904;

[35] There is no 'Polystictus stuposus' among the members of this stirps.

32: 362. 1905), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 94; *1953:* 50), and Imazeki (*1943:* 52). — HOMONYM. *Inoderma* P. Karst. (1879; 'Polyporaceae'), which see for a short note on this matter. — TYPONYMS: *Inoderma* P. Karst. (1879), rather a synisonym or variant spelling, and *Mensularia* Lázaro (1916). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the technical homonym mentioned.

Inonotus P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 39. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (and cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 137. 1880). — ETYMOLOGY: ἴς, ἰνός, fibre; οὖς, ὠτός, ear. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus hispidus* (Bull.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Four species were listed as examples. Two of these are extra-European (*Polyporus unicolor* Schw. and *P. hypococcinius* Berk.); the European ones are *P. cuticularis* (Bull.) per Fr. (first species) and *P. hispidus*. They clearly indicate that the genus, as originally conceived by Karsten, equals Fries's *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* A. *Anodermei* sect. *Spongiosi* group *contextu sporidiisque coloratis (Epicr. 458. 1838; Hym. europ. 511. 1874). This is one of the two groups which together constitute *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori hispidi* Fr. (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 55. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 39), a stirps corresponding to "Epicr. [nos.] 121–124 [= *Inonotus*], 127–132" of *Polyporus* as indicated by Fries (l.c., 1851). The examples cited by Karsten, including the extra-European ones, leave no doubt that he raised the typical group of a taxon of Fries's to generic rank for which the latter author himself had clearly indicated the type species by calling it stirps *Polypori hispidi*.[36] — TYPIFICATION. The selection of *Polyporus hispidus* will not cause any surprise after the preceding remarks. Generally Karsten's first species has been considered type, *P. cuticularis:* Murrill (*1903:* 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 593. 1904; **32**: 362. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 86. 1908), Donk (*1933:* 240), W. B. Cooke (*1980:* 87; *1953:* 50), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 56; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Imazeki (*1943:* 52), Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 78: 1. 1948), and Bondartsev (*1953:* 42). — TYPONYMS. Compare *Phaeoporus* J. Schroet. (1888) and *Polystictoides* Lázaro (1916).

Irpex Fr.—'Hydnaceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **5**: 100. 1956).

Irpiciporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 471. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: irpex, harrow, or the genus *Irpex*; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Irpex mollis* Berk. & C.—Regarded by some mycologists as identical with *Irpex pachyodon* (Pers.) Quél., from Europe. — SCOPE. Introduced with two, and one doubtful, species. — TYPONYM. Compare *Somion* Adans. (1763; devalidated name).

---

[36] Shortly after the publication of the generic name, Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 19. 1881), when listing the Finnish polypores, placed most species of *Inonotus* in a group which he marked as "*Inoderma.* Karst.", mentioning only *Polyporus cuticularis* of the remaining and presumably typical species; *P. hispidus* was not a Finnish species and, therefore, not listed with *P. cuticularis*.

Irpicium Bref., Unters. Gesamtgeb. Mykol. **15**: 143. 1912. — ETYMOLOGY: derived from the name *Irpex*. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Irpicium ulmicola* Bref.—Judging from the description and figures I believe this to be identical with *Daedalea biennis* (Bull.) per Fr. — VALID PUBLICATION. Descriptio generico-specifica. — TYPONYM: *Heteroporus* Lázaro (1916), and compare *Abortiporus* Murrill (1908), if Brefeld's species is correctly identified above.

Irpicochaete J. Rick.—'Hydnaceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **5**: 101. 1956).

Ischnoderma P. Karst. *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 38. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (and cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 137. 1880; Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 606. 1904). — ETYMOLOGY: ἰσχνός, dry, thin; δέρμα, skin. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus resinosus* (Schrad.) per Fr. sensu Fr. = *P. benzoinus* Wahlenb. Fr. — SCOPE. Five species were listed as examples. These, and Karsten's generic description, show that the genus corresponds exactly with Fries's *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* B. *Placodermei* sect. *Suberosi* group *contextu colorato (Epicr. 460. 1838; Hym. europ. 553. 1874) = *Polyporus* stirps *Suberosi* Fr. pr. p. (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 56. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 40). — TYPIFICATION. Karsten's first species, sometimes also called *Polyporus fuliginosus* (Scop.) per Fr., has been accepted as type: Murrill [*1903:* 99. as "*I. rubiginosum* (Schrad.)"; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 606. 1904; **32**: 354. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 82. 1908], Donk (*1933:* 175), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 51), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 54; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Imazeki (*1943:* 53), and Bondartsev (*1953:* 40). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Ischoderma*": Ainsw. & Bisby, Dict. Fung., 2nd Ed., 374. 1945.—A printing error.

Ischoderma.—See *Ischnoderma*.

Junghuhnia Corda, Anl. Stud. Mycol. 195. 1842. — ETYMOLOGY: F. W. Junghuhn. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Laschia crustacea* Jungh.—For a note on this species, see under *Laschia* Jungh. — BASINYM: *Laschia* Jungh. (1838), q.v. — REMARK. *Junghuhnia* was introduced as a name change for *Laschia* Jungh. (not *Laschia* Fr.). — SYNISONYM: *Aschersonia* Endl. (1842), q.v.—This name was published in the same year but a few months earlier than *Junghuhnia*, see O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 444. 1898]. — HOMONYM: *Junghuhnia* Miq. (1859; Euphorbiaceae). — W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 51) mentioned a homonym "*Junghuhnia* Endl." evidently an error for '*Aschersonia* Endl.' — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Junguhnia*"; Lév. *in* Dict. univ. Hist. nat. **8**: 487. 1846 (Consid. mycol. 107. 1846); *apud* Sicard, Hist. nat. Champ. 19. 1883.

Kordera Adans.—Deuteromycetes (to be published).

Laccocephalum McAlp. & Tepper *in* Proc. roy. Soc. Victoria II **7**: 166. 1895. — ETYMOLOGY: λάκκος cistern; κεφαλή, head. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only

original species): *Laccocephalum basilapiloides* McAlp. & Tepper.—Altered into *L.* "*basilapidodes*" by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347). For a more recent description of this fungus see Cleland (Toadst. Mushr. S. Austr. **2**: 208 *f.* 44, *pl.* 8 *f.* 2. 1935).

Laetiporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 607. 1904; **32**: 485. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: laetus, bright; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): "*Agaricus speciosus* Batt." = *Polyporus sulphureus* (Bull.) per Fr. — TYPONYMS: *Polyporus* (Pers.) per S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied) & *Cladoporus* (Pers.) Chev. (1826), nomina monstrositatium.

Lamyxis Rafin., Ann. Nat. ou ann. Synop. 16. 1820 (pre-Friesian). — A nomen provisorium. Under *Sisotrema* [!] *globularis* Rafin. one finds the remark, "Perhaps a new genus, *Lamyxis*, intermediate between *Sisotrema* [!] and *Boletus*." — The description of the species involved runs:

"Stipe lateral, exceedingly short: peride globular, white above, flattened and reddish brown beneath, with a marginal concentric furrow. — Found on a Beech tree on the Catskill mountains; pores unequal, polygonal, lacerated."—Rafinesque (l.c.).

Laricifomes Kotlaba & Pouz. *in* Česká Mykol. **11**: 158. 1957. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Larix*; the genus *Fomes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus officinalis* (Vill.) per Fr. — TYPONYMS: *Agarico-polyporus* Haller (1742; pre-Linnean name) and *Agarico-pulpa* Paul. (1793; devalidated name); and compare *Agaricon* [Tourn.] Adans.

Laschia Jungh. *in* Verh. Bataviaasch Genootsch. **17** [2]: 74. "1839" [reprint, 1838]; Mont. *in* Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) II **17**: 317. 1841. — ETYMOLOGY: W. G. Lasch. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Laschia crustacea* Jungh.—Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **8**: 587. 1910) studied Junghuhn's type specimen. He did not identify it with *Hymenogramme javensis* Berk. & Mont., but assigned to it a place in the genus *Poria* (*sensu lato*), as *Poria crustacea* (Jungh.) Bres. — SCOPE. Based on two very different species of which the first is *Laschia spathulata* Jungh. — TYPIFICATION. Of the two original species *L. spathulata* was first removed from the genus (cf., for instance, quotation under *Hymenogramme*) and is now regarded as a member of *Favolus* Fr. (*Polyporus vibecinus* Fr.). So the second species became automatically considered type of the generic name (and of its isonym *Junghuhnia* Corda); it was formally appointed as such by O. Kuntze [Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 443. 1898] who has been followed by Murrill (*1903:* 92, 99), Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 182. 1941), and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 54). — HOMONYM: *Laschia* Fr. (1830; Auriculariaceae). — ISONYMS. The fact that *Laschia* Jungh. is preoccupied, has found its expression in the publication of the name changes *Aschersonia* Endl. (1842), q.v., and *Junghuhnia* Corda (1842, a few months younger), q.v. Both were introduced for the genus in its original sense. — TYPONYM. See note under *Hymenogramme*. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Lentus (Lloyd) *ex* Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920. — ETYMOLOGY: lentus, pliant or tough. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus brumalis* (Pers.) per Fr.

BASINYM: [*Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Lenti* Fr., Epicr. 430. 1838; *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori lenti* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 48. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 32);] "Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Lentus* Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 100, 170. 1912.—Lloyd's sectional name was not validly published, in my opinion, because the sectional epithet was not associated with a generic name. See also below.

VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. The generic name was validly published in a key to the genera of stipitate polypores of Brazil, in a paper that was issued in instalments but which was never completed as far as I know. The monographic treatment of *Lentus*, for instance, did not appear in print. As Torrend kept closely to Lloyd's work on the same groups, the generic name is here unconditionally identified with that author's taxon, "Section *Lentus*", which in its turn is derived from Fries's, as indicated above.

TYPIFICATION. Of *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori lenti*, Fries (l.c., 1851) wrote: "Typos gregis, inter platyporos et microporos exacte medius, est *P. brumalis*, sed nomen sumsi a *P. lento* [Beik.], cum hoc in omnes quadrat. Spec. 11–20 in Syn. Hymen. [= Epicr.]." When Fries established the group (in 1838) *Polyporus lentus* was not yet included.

REMARKS. '*Lentus*' is one of several sections of stipitate polypores used by Lloyd and raised unaltered to generic rank by Torrend. The paper of the latter author, which covered only Brazilian species, appeared in instalments in the periodial "Brotéria" (Sér. bot., 1920–6) and was never completed. The new generic names appeared first in a key to the genera and most of these genera were fully dealt with separately later.

As was already remarked:

"Lloyd has been careful to point out that he considered the names he uses as being sectional only, yet under his illustrations and in his indices, he uses these sectional names in a generic sense; hence they must be listed as synonyms of *Polyporus*."—Cunningham (*in* Trans. N. Zeal. Inst. **58**: 223. 1927).

Cunningham listed: *Amaurodermus*, *Lentus*, *Lignosus*, *Merismus*, *Ovinus*, and *Petaloides*. This does not mean that these 'names' were validly published by Lloyd as generic ones; they were never definitely accepted as such by him. The following quotations from Lloyd's work are given to support the following conclusions. (i) Several of the sectional names were not validly published because they were not associable with a definite generic name. "Stipitate Polyporoids" of Lloyd included species of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. as well as *Polystictus* Fr., and one species of *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr.; he maintained these as the correct generic names and he used them in other parts of his work in specific combinations. (ii) These sectional names are to be considered as applications or isonyms of names previously published by Fries, Patouillard, and Quélet. (iii) Lloyd gave references to these previously published names.

"The stipitate Polyporoids. . . . The first and we think the best division of the pore species was made by Fries (1851) in his Novae Symbolae. . . . Of the eleven sections into which we have divided the stipitate species, nine of them have been taken mostly in their original signification from Fries' work. Professor Patouillard has outlined a plan of division . . . [that] embraced a few new ideas and two of them, the sections *Ganodermus* and *Amaurodermus* we have adopted [p. 95] . . . Cooke tried to arrange the names [of the polypores] according to the Friesian system . . .. In this pamphlet the stipitate species are divided into eleven sections, or genera if one so desires to call them, but we prefer to call them sections. . . . Nine of our divisions we have taken from the work of Fries and two from that of Patouillard. [p. 97] . . . As to nomenclature we have employed the sectional name as the first binomial [!] . . . and these sectional names are all old and familiar . . .. [p. 98] . . . The section *Ganodermus* was first proposed for the common *Polyporus lucidus* of Europe, . . . *Amaurodermus* is a tropical section. . . . The other sections that we adopt are the well-known sections of Fries' system that need no special explanation other than our key. . . . The names for the sections are mostly the same that Fries use. In one case, *Perennis*, we use another name, *Pelloporus*, for reasons we have previously stated . . . [p. 99]."—Lloyd (Mycol. Writ. **3**, Stip. Polyp. 1912). ". . . Quélet who called Fries' section, *Perennes*, *Pelloporus*. . . ."—Lloyd (Myc. Writ. **3**, Polyp. Iss. No. 1: 1. 1908). — "In dividing the Polyporei into sections we think the best and simplest plan is to follow the lines laid out by Fries, and the section *Ovinus* [of *Polyporus*] is the first division in the Friesian system. . . ."—Lloyd (Mycol. Writ. **3**, Syn. Sect. Ovinus: 73. 1911).

From this information it is possible to establish the basinyms of Lloyd's sectional names for the stalked polypores.

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Ganodermus* Lloyd ≡ *Ganoderma* P. Karst. emend. Pat., in part.

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Amaurodermus* Lloyd ≡ *Ganoderma* sect. *Amauroderma* Pat.

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Lignosus* Lloyd ≡ ? *Polystictus* stirps *P. sacri* Fr. (1851) ≡ ? *Polyporus* sect. *Hornotini* Fr. (1838).

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Petaloides* Lloyd ≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Petaloides* Cooke ≡ *Polyporus* stirps *P. petaloidis* Fr. (1851).

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Merismus* Lloyd ≡ *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr. (1821).

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Spongiosus* Lloyd ≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Spongiosa* Cooke ≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Spongiosi* Fr. (1874, 1838) ≡ *Polyporus* stirps *Spongiosa* Fr. (1851).

Polystictus sect. *Pelloporus* (Quél.) Lloyd ≡ *Pelloporus* Quél.

Polyporus sect. *Ovinus* Lloyd ≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Ovini* Cooke ≡ *Polyporus* stirps *P. ovini* Fr. (1851).

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Lentus* Lloyd ≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Lenti* Cooke ≡ *Polyporus* stirps *P. lenti* Fr. (1851).

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Melanopus* Lloyd ≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Melanopodes* Cooke ≡ *Polyporus* stirps *P. melanopodis* Fr. (1851).

"Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Fomes* Lloyd.—Not raised to generic rank.

The generic names used by Torrend are *Amauroderma* [see *Amauroderma* (Pat.) Torrend], *Lentus*, *Lignosus*, q.v., *Merismus* (*Merisma*) [see *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill.], *Pelloporus* (see *Pelloporus* Quél.), *Petaloides*, q.v., and *Spongiosus*, q.v. Torrend left no doubt that in the first part of his paper (1920) the names were given to genera, and

in the subsequent parts this is also shown by the treatment of the groups. (Nevertheless he often referred to them as 'sections'.) When he arrived at the treatment of *Ovinus*, he used *Polyporus* instead, placing '*Ovinus*' in parentheses after that name. He unequivocally stated that he took up Lloyd's sections and with them their sectional epithets as generic names; he also kept to Lloyd's circumscriptions of the groups. In connection with the typification of Torrend's names it should be remembered that he did not change the definitions of Lloyd's groups (the author identified his genera categorically with Lloyd's sections) and thus that the type species are to be selected from those originally admitted rather than from the Brazilian species treated in his monograph which covered a limited area.

TYPONYMS: *Polyporellus* P. Karst. (1879) and *Leucoporus* Quél. (1886).

Lenzites Fr., Fl. scán. 339. 1835; Gen. Hym. 10. 1836; Epicr. 403. 1838. — ETYMOLOGY: F. A. Lenz. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Daedalea betulina* (L.) per Fr. — SCOPE. When the generic name was validly published (1835), by a very short description, no species were mentioned. The next year (1836) some examples were listed: "*Daed. betulina, abietina, heteromorpha*, etc." A full treatment of the genus appeared in 1838. — TYPIFICATION. By an oversight and working under the first-species rule Murrill (*1903:* 92, 99) originally took *Lenzites applanata* (Fr. ex Klotzsch) Fr. as type, it being the first of the species treated of 1838. He was followed in this respect only by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 55). It should be rejected as it is not among the examples of 1836; Murrill himself (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 95. 492. 1955; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 127. 1908) soon abandoned *L. applanata* to replace it by a much more eligible species (the first of 1836), *Daedalea betulina*. The same species was suggested by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) and selected by Donk (*1933:* 199), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 64; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 67), Imazeki (*1943:* 74), Singer & A. H. Smith (*in* Mycologia **38**: 256. 1946), Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 30: 2, 5. 1948), Bondartsev (*1953:* 50), Overholts (*1953:* 107), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 160). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Leuzites*": Cerniaiev *in* Bull. Soc. Nat. Moskou **18** (2): 140. 1845.—An error. Name only. — TYPONYM: *Leucolenzites* R. Falck (1909), q.v. And compare *Cellularia* Bull. per Corda (1842).

Lenzitina P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 287, 337. 1889. — ETYMOLOGY: derived from the name *Lenzites*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Lenzites sepiaria* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. — SCOPE. Same as of *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst.; four species were listed of which the first is *Lenzites sepiaria*. — TYPIFICATION. This name is factually nothing but a name change for *Gloeophyllum* and should be typified by the same species, *Lenzites sepiaria*; the latter was considered type by Murrill (*1903:* 96, 99; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 602. 1904; **32**: 370. 1905) and W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 94; *1953:* 55) who identified it with *Agaricus hirsutus* Schaeff.; and Imazeki (*1943:* 55). — BASINYM. *Lenzitina* might well be interpreted as a mere isonym of *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. (1882), q.v. The reason for coining this new

name is not clear. — TYPONYMS: *Serda* Adans. (1763; devalidated name) and *Sesia* Adans. per O.K. (1891).

Leptopora Rafin. *in* Med. Repos., New York, 2nd Hex., **5**: 355. 1808; *in* J. Bot. (réd. Soc. Bot.), Paris **2**: 177. 1809 (French translation); (devalidated name). — Generic description: "differs from the sessile *Boletus* by its substance, and being covered all over by pores." Species, *Leptopora difformis* Rafin., *L. nivea* Rafin., and *L. stercoraria* Rafin., all nomina nuda. The order in the French version is *L. nivea*, *L. stercoraria*, and *L. difformis*. — A nomen dubium. — Murrill (*1903:* 90), who cited the French version as place of publication, considered the genus "founded on *L. nivea* and two other species"; W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 57), too, cited only the French version, and gave *L. nivea* as type species. — Homonym. See under *Leptoporus*. — "*Leptostroma*. Rafin." of Reichenbach (Consp. Regni veg. 15. 1828) is evidently an error for *Leptopora*. In my opinion Reichenbach did not validly publish this name: the reasons for this conclusion are the same as those stated under *Phorima* Rafin.

Leptoporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 175. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: λεπτός, thin; πόρος, pore. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus mollis* (Pers.) per Fr.—Concerning the identity of this fungus (as interpreted by Fries), it is no easy matter to decide what species Fries called by this name when he defined the taxon in 1838 (same description in 1874). Romell (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **20**: 14. 1926) suggested that the original *P. mollis* of Persoon is *P. borealis* Fr., and that Fries's interpretation covered a widely different fungus which Romell called *P. albobrunneus* Romell, a species never forming considerable reflexed portions in the fruit-body. I find it difficult to accept the second suggestion which conflicts in many details with Fries's description (Epicr. 454. 1838). Pilát (*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 174 *f. 85, pl. 99.* 1937) describes as *Leptoporus mollis* (Pers. per Fr.) Pilát a fungus which he identifies with "*L. erubescens* (Fr.)" of Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 542 *f. 152.* 1928). For additional accounts, see Overholts (*1953:* 277 *pl. 23 fs. 137, 138, pl. 130 fig.*, as *Polyporus mollis*) and Kotlaba & Pouzar [*in* Česká Mykol. **13**: 27 *(2) fs.* 1959, as *Tyromyces mollis* (Pers. per Fr.) Kotlaba & Pouz.].

SCOPE. The genus as introduced covered exactly the same group as *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* A. *Anodermei* sect. *Carnosi* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 358. 1821; Epicr. 452. 1838; Hym. europ. 545. 1874), although this was not expressly indicated. Quélet's first species is *Polyporus epileucus* Fr.

TYPIFICATION. Because the genus is nothing but a pre-existing group raised to generic rank, the generic name should be typified by the same species as its predecessor. Fries's taxon was once called by that author (Fries *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 53. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 37), *Polyporus* "Stirps I. *Polypori mollis*. Epicr. 95–106" (the numbers indicating the species of '*Carnosi*' in his "Epicrisis"). Therefore, I prefer *Polyporus mollis* as type species of Quélet's generic name.

Quélet's first species, *Polyporus epileucus*, was indicated by Murrill (*1903:* 95, 99); he was followed by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 57) and Imazeki (*1943:* 55). — Later Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 477. 1905) adopted *Polyporus tephroleucus* Fr., Quélet's second species, perhaps because it was Quélet's first species accompanied by a reference to a figure.

Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 33. 1948) stated that "*Polyporus chioneus* Fries . . . is the type of *Leptoporus* Quél."

HOMONYM. Murrill (*l.c.*, 1905) rejected *Leptoporus* Quél. as being a later homonym of *Leptopora* Rafin., q.v. The latter name is pre-Friesian and hence not validly published. Nevertheless, Art. 75 would indeed make the two orthographically different homonyms, or rather variant spellings, although the terminations are different. — TYPONYM. Compare *Caloporus* P. Karst. (1881).

Leptostroma "Rafin."—See *Leptopora* Rafin.

Leucofomes Kotlaba & Pouz. *in* Česká Mykol. **11**: 157. 1957. — ETYMOLOGY: λευκός, white; the genus *Fomes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus ulmarius* (Sow.) per Fr.

Leucolenzites R. Falck *in* Hausschwammforsch. **3**: 37. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: λευκός, white; the genus *Lenzites*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only species mentioned by name): *Lenzites betulina* (L. per Fr.) Fr. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. As follows:

"Die Gattungen *Leucolenzites* und *Artolenzites*. Die wichtigste der hier als besondere Gattung [von *Lenzites* Fr.] abgetrennten, weiss gefärbten Formen ist die bei uns allgemein verbreitete Art *Lenzites betulina*. Die speziellen Charactere dieser Gattung weichen besonders in den Punkten 10–11 von den obigen ab."[37]

TYPONYM: *Lenzites* Fr. (1835). And compare *Cellularia* Bull. per Corda (1842).

Leucophellinus Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66, 68. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 43. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: λευκός, white; the genus *Phellinus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Trametes irpicoides* (Bondarts., ex Pilát. — PROTONYM: *Leucophellinus* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 57. 1941.—Not validly published; no Latin description.

---

[37] Falck restricted *Lenzites* to the dark coloured species (*Gloeophyllum* P. Karst.). Of the characteristics enumerated for this genus, no. 10 is "Ihre gelbe bis braune Färbung", no. 11, "Die Grenzgröszen: a) die nahezu unbegrenzte Länge und b) die andererseits sehr beschränkte, im Durchschnitt nicht über 3 cm hinausgehende Breite der freien Fruchtkörperplatten".

One species. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Leueophellinus*": Ainsw. & Bisby, Dict. Fung., 2nd Ed., 1945.—An error of printing.

Leucoporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 165. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: λευκός, white; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus brumalis* (Pers.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced for (i) *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Lenti* Fr. (Epicr. 430. 1838; Hym. europ. 526. 1874) plus (ii) a part of *Polyporus* trib. *Pleuropus* sect. *Lenti* Fr. (Epicr. 438. 1838; Hym. europ. 532. 1874), including *Polyporus melanopus* (Pers.) per Fr.; however, these sectional names were not mentioned. Ten species (and one more with a point of interrogation) were described by Quélet. His first species is *Polyporus lepideus* Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The two groups of Fries included and maintained by Quélet are readily typifiable by *Polyporus brumalis* (see under *Lentus*) and *P. melanopus* (see under *Cerioporus*); these two species appear the most eligible ones. Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 136–137. 1887) restricted the genus by excluding the element belonging to *Melanopus* Pat.; he indicated as "Espèces principales: *L. brumalis*, *L. ciliatus*, *L. arcularius*, etc." The selection of *Polyporus brumalis* in the present paper, will thus be explained. Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 23. 1948) states that *P. brumalis* was made the type of *Leucoporus*. — Murrill (*1903:* 95, 99) originally considered the name based on *Polyporus lepideus* Fr. per Fr., but soon changed his mind and (Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 484. 1905) indicated *Polyporus tubarius* Quél., Quélet's second species as type, perhaps because it is the first species accompanied by a reference to a figure. W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 58), too, considered the generic name as based on *Polyporus lepideus*. Imazeki (*1943:* 55) followed; he indicated that he regarded it as synonymous with *P. brumalis*. — TYPONYMS: *Polyporellus* P. Karst. (1879) and *Lentus* (Lloyd) ex Torrend (1920).

Licentia Pilát.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 83. 1957).

Lignosus (Lloyd) *ex* Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920; **20**: 107. 1922; **21**: 12. 1924. — ETYMOLOGY: lignosus, woody. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus sacer* Afz. ex Fr. — BASINYM: "Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Lignosus* Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 122. 1912.—"This section embraces stipitate species, that are subligneous but not perennial." Some of the outstanding original species are, *Polyporus sacer* and *Fomes* [!] *rhinocerotis* Cooke, *P. superpositus* Berk., *P. dealbatus* Berk. & C., and *P. corrugis* Fr.; these are all depicted. From the "Remarks" given under *Lentus* (this paper, p. 233) one would suspect that Fries had already distinguished this group. It is not evident which group Lloyd had in mind, but if one wants to identify Lloyd's taxon with one of Fries's there is only one possibility: *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Hornotini* Fr. (Epicr. 436. 1838) ≡ *Polystictus* stirps *Polysticti sacri* Fr. (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 72. 1851), of which, of course, *Polyporus sacer* is the inevitable type. — SCOPE & VALID PUBLICATION. The generic

name was first published in a key to the genera of stipitate polypores. This key was preceded by the remark, "Comme [M. Lloyd], nous diviserons les Polyporacées stipitées de la façon suivante." No species were dealt with: the genus was to be treated in a subsequent instalment of Torrend's paper. The original scope of his genus must be accepted as identical with that of Lloyd's cited section. — The treatment of the genus appeared a few years later, twice (Torrend, op. cit., **20**: 107. 1922; **21**: 12. 1924). Here the group is still treated as a genus, although Torrend remarked about "cette section de l'immense groupe du genre *Polyporus*": "Si nous ne craignions de nous laisser guider par l'esprit de nouveauté contre lequel M. Lloyd s'insurge avec tant d'à propos à cause des révolutions incessantes qu'il cause dans la Systématique, nous serions portés à supprimer le genre *Lignosus*, et en à faire à peine une section du g. *Amauroderma*." Eight Brazilian species were treated under names of which the generic appellation was *Lignosus*. There is no doubt that Torrend adhered to *Lignosus* as a genus. Compare also under *Lentus*. — TYPIFICATION. It is with considerable hesitation that I select *Polyporus sacer* as type species, which gives the generic name a chance to survive. — REMARK. Another author who accepted a "Genus *Lignosus*" (no author's citation, no description) was Sawada (Descr. Cat. Formosa Fungi V *in* Rep. Dep. Agr. Govt Res. Inst. Formosa No. 51. 1931).

Lindtneria Pilát *in* Stud. bot. čechosl. **1**: 72. 1938. – ETYMOLOGY: V. Lindtner. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Poria trachyspora* Bourd. & G. — HOMONYM. Compare *Lindnera* Reichenb. (1837; Tiliaceae)?

Lopharia Kalchbr. & McOwan.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 83. 1957).

Loxophyllum Klotzsch; Hook., Bot. Misc. **2**: 150 *pl. 79.* 1831 (as a synonym). — This name was cited as a synonym, as "(*Loxophyllum* Klotzsch, MSS.)", under *Cyclomyces* Kunze as published by Hooker (cf. *Cyclomyces* Fr.). The corresponding specific name, cited as a synonym of *Cyclomyces fuscus* Kunze, is *L. velutinum* Klotzsch MS. — Not *Loxophyllum* Blume (1826, Scrophulariaceae).

Melanoporella Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 14. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Melanoporia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus carbonaceus* Berk. & C.

Melanoporia Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 14. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: μέλας, μέλανος, black; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus niger* Berk.—For a modern description, see Lowe [*in* Tech. Publ. New York St. Coll. For. No. 65: 78. 1946; as *Poria nigra* (Berk.) Cooke].

Melanopus Pat., Hym. Eur. 137. 1887. — ETYMOLOGY: μέλας, μέλανος, black; πούς, foot. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (of supposed basinym): *Polyporus melanopus* (Pers.) per Fr.

BASINYM (supposed): [*Polyporus* trib. *Pleuropus* sect. *Lenti* Fr., Epicr. 438. 1838 —] *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori melanopodis* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 50. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 34) [≡ *Polyporus* sect. *Melanopodes* Cooke *in* Grevillea **13**: 82. 1885].—There can be no hesitation in taking *Polyporus melanopus* as type of the stirps *Polypori melanopodis* of Fries. When that author treated the taxon under that name he made it clear that it was equal to "Spec. 41–50. Epicr. S.M." = *Polyporus* sect. *Lenti* Fr., Epicr. 438, of which *P. melanopus* was one of the original species.

SCOPE. When Patouillard (l.c.) published the generic name be listed as examples. "Espèces principales: *M. squamosus*, *M. varius*, *M. picipes*, *M. elegans*, *M. nummularius*, etc."

TYPIFICATION. With our present knowledge the species mentioned by Patouillard are divisable into two rather different groups: (i) *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. and (ii) all the others. Of group (i), represented by Patouillard's first species (*P. squamosus*) only some (or some forms) have a black stipe: this group coincides with the type group of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. Selection of *P. squamosus* would lead to the loss of the name *Melanopus* as a synonym of *Polyporus sensu strictissimo*. This species was inevitably indicated as type by Murrill [*1903:* 95, 100, as "*M. caudicinus* (Scop.)"; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 484. 1905]. He was followed by van Overeem (*in* Ic. Fung. malay. H. 7: 3. 1924), W. B. Cooke (*1940*: 95; *1953:* 61), and Imazeki (*1943:* 55).

To avoid the loss of the name *Melanopus*, Donk (*1933:* 129), who excluded group (i), applied it to the biggest, second, portion of the original genus (containing four of the five species mentioned by name). This would save the name for future use for a group in need of it (whether or not in generic rank). To obtain this goal I now suggest as type *Polyporus melanopus*, defending it by the following argument.

Although, when first publishing the generic name (1887) Patouillard did not indicate a basinym, *Melanopus* undoubtly represents exactly the same taxon as stirps *Polypori melanopodis* Fr. This was admitted by Patouillard himself in 1900 (Essai taxon. Hym. 80) when be cited as (the only) unconditional synonym of *Melanopus*, "*Polyporus*, Stirps D; *Melanopodes* Fr., Nov. Symb., p. 50", of which *Polyporus melanopus* is the obvious type. One may raise the objection that that species was not listed as an example when the generic name was introduced, but the answer would be that it is likely that Patouillard considered that species a synonym, or that it is one of the species covered by "etc." In any case there is no evidence that he ever excluded *P. melanopus* from the taxon.

Mensularia Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 736. 1916; Polip. Fl. Españ. 121. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: mensula, small table. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected):

Polyporus radiatus (Sow.) per Fr.[38] —Correctly determined? — SCOPE. Introduced with six species. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was taken as type by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 61) and Imazeki (*1943:* 55). — Pinto-Lopes (*in* Mem. Soc. broter. **8**: 162. 1952) adopted the name and applied it to an emended genus mentioning as the only representative another of the original species, viz. *Polyporus ulmarius* (Sow.) per Fr. (type species of *Leucofomes* Kotlaba & Pouz. 1957). — TYPONYMS: *Inoderma* P. Karst. (1879) and *Inodermus* Quél. (1886).

Meripilus P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: viii, 33. 1882. — ETYMOLOGY: μερίς, part or portion; πῖλος, cap. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES selected : *Polyporus giganteus* (Pers.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with four species. This genus does not correspond well with any of Fries's sections of *Polyporus*. First species, *Polyporus giganteus*. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was indicated as type by Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 481. 1905), who was followed by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95, "Probably based upon *Boletus giganteus* Pers."; *1953:* 62) and Imazeki (*1943:* 56). — TYPONYM: *Flabellopilus* Kotlaba & Pouz. (1957), q.v.

Merisma (Fr.) Gill., Champ. France, Hym. 688. 1878. — ETYMOLOGY: μέρισμα, part or portion. Gender: n.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus frondosus* (Dicks.) per Fr.

BASINYM: *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 354. 1821; Epicr. 445. 1838; Hym europ. 537. 1874.—The original species (of 1821) are *Polyporus umbellatus* (Pers.) per Fr., *P. frondosus*, *P. confluens* (A. & S.) per Fr., *P. giganteus* (Pers.) per Fr., *P. cristatus* (Schaeff.) per Fr., *P. sulphureus* (Bull.) per Fr., and *P. imbricatus* Bull. per Fr. This tribus name is the avowed basinym of the generic one: Gillet called the genus "*Merisma*, Fr."

SCOPE. Gillet's genus was exactly the same as Fries's tribus of 1874 (l.c.) which is an increased edition of the original group, still containing all of the original species; the latter are without a single exception among Gillet's species, which number 31.

TYPIFICATION. *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill., *Polypilus* P. Karst. (1881), q.v., and *Cladomeris* Quél. (1886), q.v., are all names for exactly the same group raised to generic rank, viz. for *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr. The only original element contributed by the authors of the generic names is that they raised Fries's group to the rank of a genus. If the name had not been preoccupied by *Merisma* Pers. one might even suppose that all three would have published the same generic name. As it were, Gillet was presumably the only one who overlooked the earlier homonym. Here is a fine example of what happens if one applies blindly the first-species rule. Quélet listed the species (of *Cladomeris*) in Fries's order (1874) and consequently Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 334. 1904; **32**: 481. 1905) indicated *P. umbellatus* as type species of *Cladomeris* Quél. Gillet started from the other end, with the result that his first

[38] Mentioned by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 61) as "*Boletus radicatus* Sow."

(French) species, *P. imberbis* (Bull. per Mérat) Fr.,[39] became the type species of *Merisma* for Murrill (*1903:* 93, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 477. 1905; **32**: 633. 1906) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 62). Karsten listed only the Finnish examples of the group: type species designated by Murrill (*1903:* 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 481. 1905), *P. frondosus*. Nevertheless, these generic names and Fries's tribal denomination are merely different names for exactly the same taxon. The course to be followed in this case is rather to select a type species for Fries's group and to attribute that choice also to the three generic names, keeping in mind the principle that the change of rank does not alter the type.

Fries divided his tribus from the start into three groups, not named in 1821, but called by him '*Carnosi*', '*Lenti*', and '*Caseosi*' in 1838 and 1874, and once also, *Polyporus* stirpes *Polypori frondosi*, *P. lobati*, and *P. imbricati* (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 53. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 37). The groups underwent no changes (except additions). This leads to the conclusion that the most eligible species are *Polyporus frondosus* and *P. imbricatus*; *P. lobatus* does not figure among the original species (1821). (From 1838 onwards Fries added a fourth section, '*Suberosi*'.) Fries (1821, 1838, 1874) always listed *P. umbellatus* first. From these notes it appears difficult to choose any other species than *P. frondosus* as type of the basinym as well as of *Merisma*, *Polypilus*, and *Cladomeris*.

SYNISONYMS: *Merismus* (Lloyd) *ex* Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920; **21**: 35. 1924 (as *Merisma*).—One of the sections of stipitate polypores distinguished by Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 148. 1912] is "Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Merismus*, which in its turn is nothing but an isonym of *Polyporus* trib. *Merisma* Fr. Torrend raised it to generic rank, indicating expressly Lloyd's sectional name as basinym. See also notes under *Lentus*. In case it ought technically to be regarded as a different (although homonymous) name from *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill., it still must be typififed by the same type species, *Polyporus frondosus*. — Variant spelling. "L'étymologie grecque de ce nom m'oblige à corriger *Merismus* des clefs [1920] en *Merisma*."—Torrend (l.c., 1924). — The other synisonyms are discussed above.

HOMONYM: *Merisma* Pers. per S. F. Gray (1821; 'Thelephoraceae'). — TYPONYMS: *Polypilus* P. Karst. (1881) and *Cladomeris* Quél. (1886) are rather synisonyms. — *Grifola* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Cladodendron* Lázaro (1916); and compare *Flabellaria* Chev. (1826; not validly published). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Merismus.—See *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill.

Merulius Pers. 1784 &
Merulius Fr. 1821.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 10. 1958).

Merulioporia Bond. & Sing.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 12. 1958).

[39] Not an original species of Fries's group of 1821.

Meruliporia Murrill.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 13. 1958).

Microcarpus.—See *Microporus*.

Microporellus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 483. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Microporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Polyporus dealbatus* Berk. & C.—For this species, see Overholts (*1953*: 223). — SCOPE. Introduced with two species.

Microporus P. Beauv. *per* O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 494. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: μικρός, small; πόρος, pore. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES selected: *Microporus perula* P. Beauv.—Identified by Hariot (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **7**: 206–207. 1891) with *Polyporus xanthopus* Fr. per Fr.

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Microporus* P. Beauv., Fl. Oware **1**: 12. 1805 (description reproduced by Hariot, op. cit., p. 206).[40]—As to the scope of the genus, one will find this remark on page 13 of Palisot de Beauvois's Flore:

"Les *Microporus* . . . J'ai en rapporté d'Afrique trois espèces nouvelles, que je publierai successivement. On en connait trois autres espèces en Europe: les Bolets coriace, nummulaire et polypore de Bulliard."

Accompanying the publication of the generic name is the description and illustration of *Microporus perula* (p. 14 *pl. 8 f. 2*). Follows in 1806 (p. 73 *pl. 43 f. 1*), thus disconnected from what was previously published on the genus, the publication of a second (African) species: *Microporus concinnus* P. Beauv. The third African species is not to be found in the first volume of Palisot's flora. The Bulliardian species are (i) *Boletus coriaceus* Scop. = *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr.; (ii) *B. nummularius* Bull.; and (iii) *B. polyporus* Bull. (Herb. France *pl. 469*; *non* Retz.), generally referred to *Polyporus brumalis* (Pers.) per Fr. These species, it may be assumed, were known to Palisot only from Bulliard's work.

VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. In a note entitled "Le genre Microporus Palis." by Hariot (op. cit., pp. 206–207) that author concluded:

"Le genre *Polystictus* a été en grande partie établi sur les caractères assignées par Palisot au *Microporus*. Il ne serait que juste de laisser au botaniste français le mérite de sa creation et de conserver le genre *Microporus* pour les *Polyporus* qui se rangent dans le voisinage des *P. xanthopus* et *sacer*."—Hariot (op. cit., p. 207).

Hariot reproduced Palisot's generic description and discussed the two species *Microporus concinnus* et *M. perula*. The first seemed to him a good species; while *M. perula* he identified with *Polyporus xanthopus*: "Le nom donné par Fries devra donc rentrer dans la synonymie." I find it difficult to conclude that Hariot definitely accepted the genus and, thus, that he validly re-published the generic name.

The author who accepted the generic name unconditionally was O. Kuntze [Rev.

---

[40] See Merrill (*in* Proc. Amer. phil. Soc. **76**: 914 sqq. 1936) and Marshall (*in* Kew Bull. **1951**: 43–49), for the dates of publication of Palisot's work.

Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 494. 1898] and it is currently ascribed to him. In the absence of an accompanying description, the valid publication of *Microporus* by Kuntze depends on the reference to the pre-Friesian description, "*Microporus* Beauv. 1804/5 Flore d'Oware I: 12–14 & 73, t. 8 & 43", which is sufficient according to the present formulation of the Code. This conclusion necessitates the acceptance of the original scope of the genus for Kuntze's re-publication, although that author applied *Microporus* to "*Polystictus* Cooke 1886 non Fries 1821 . . . *Polystictus* . . . 1886 . . . Saccardo sylloge . . .."[41]

TYPIFICATION. Since Palisot's original species are the only ones from which the type should be chosen,[42] a preference for *M. perula* will need no clarification: it was already indicated as type species of Palisot's name by Murrill (*1903:* 90, 100) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 63).

Several authors considered *M. concinnus* type of *Microporus* as re-published by Kuntze: W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 63) and Imazeki (*1943:* 56). Although not mentioned by name by Palisot among the original contents of the genus and formally described a year after the publication of the genus, it may yet be assumed that it was an original species: "J'ai en rapporté d'Afrique trois especes nouvelles." However, there is no certainty about this matter and small reason in general to prefer it above *M. perula.*

REMARK. The original genus, as published by Palisot, as well as the taxon to which Kuntze applied the name, are quite inclusive groups from our present point of view. Both Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 342. 1821) and Persoon (Mycol. europ. **2**: 39. 1825) adopted it as a subdivision of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. It was Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 83. 1900) who drastically reduced the taxon and gave it almost its present circumscription, with *M. concinnus* as the species figured as an example [and without mention of *M. perula* which was apparently included in *M. xanthopus* (Fr.) O.K.].

"VARIANT SPELLINGS": "*Microcarpus*"; Steud., Nomencl. bot. Pl. crypt. 287. 1824 (as a synonym) & "*Micropus*"; *in* Neu. J. Bot. **3**: 91. 1809 (matter of record).—Evidently unintentional errors.

Milleporus Pfeiffer, Nomencl. bot. **2**: 317. 1874 ("Batsch"; incidental mention & as a synonym). — Perhaps due to an error Pfeiffer listed *Boletus* subordo III *Milleporei* Batsch (Elench. 101. 1783) as *Milleporus* "Batsch", as a generic name. (See also *Retiporus.*) He identified it with "*Microporus* Palis." Batsch introduced the group for the stalked polypores; his first species is *Boletus lacteus* Batsch, which includes *Polyporus tuberaster* (Jacq.) per Fr. (cited as "Mich. LXXI. f. 1" as a variety).

---

[41] Kuntze got mixed up between *Polyporus* subgen. *Polysticta* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 385. 1821), introduced for *Polyporus* (= *Poria*) *corticola* Fr. and another species, and the genus *Polystictus* Fr. (1851), q.v., applied by Cooke (1886) and Saccardo (1888); the two have no relation to each other.

[42] And compare Kuntze (l.c.), "Palisot de Beauvois hatte zwei Arten die beide hierzu gehören; *Microporus concinnus* und *M. perula* Beauv. . . ."

I consider this species the type of Batsch's name, and more in particular select from the species included under *B. lacteus* the variety representing *P. tuberaster* (selected type species of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.). — Batsch's name was taken up by Duby (Bot. gall. **2**: 784. 1830) and Matthieu (Fl. gén. Belg. **2**: 333. 1854), as *Polyporus* subsect. *Milleporus* Duby and *Polyporus* sect. *Milleporus* (Duby) Matth. (ascribed to Batsch), as a substitute for *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* Fr.

Mison Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 10. 1763 (devalidated name). — Introduced with special reference to the three species of *Agaricum* depicted on Micheli's plates 62 and 63 (Nov. Pl. Gen. 121. 1729). These fungi are very different from each other. The first has been traditionally identified with a resupinate variety of *Polyporus igniarius* (L.) per Fr. (cf. Fries, Hym. europ. 559. 1874). This determination is open to serious doubt, although the fungus seems indeed to present a resupinate and strongly cushion-shaped member of *Phellinus* Quél. The two species depicted on plate 63 were to form the kernel of *Amphitretia* Hill, q.v. — According to Murrill (*1903*: 87), "the name *Mison* properly belongs with the first [species] which is *Polyporus igniarius* L. Fr."; and compare Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 369. 1905), "Type: *Boletus igniarius* L. (Micheli's pl. 62)." — Variant spelling: "*Myson*"; Leman *in* Dict. Sci. nat. **34**: 88. 1825; Endl., Gen. Pl. 39. 1836; (as a synonym). — Homonym: *Mison* Fr., Fl. scan. 351. 1835 ("Tuberacei"). — Typonyms: *Scindalma* [Hill] O.K. (1898), and compare *Boletus* S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied), and *Pseudofomes* Lázaro (1916).

[*Monka* Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 5. 1763. — Type species (only species mentioned): "*Boletus*. Battar. *t. 3. f. D*" = *Boletus pileolo Monachi* Batt. = *Helvella conformis* Pers. = *Verpa patula* Fr. — As far as I know not validly published. Leman (*in* Dict. Sci. nat. **32**: 457. 1824) discusses *Monka*, giving the available information, rejects it as a synonym of *Verpa* Sw., which is correct. — The name is briefly discussed here because Endlicher (Gen. Pl. 40. 1836) lists it as a synonym of one of the subdivisions of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr., evidently in error.]

Mucilago Hoffm., Deutschl. Fl. o. bot. Taschenb. **2**: text to *pl. 12 f. 2*. 1795 (devalidated name). — This name is sometimes listed as if to indicate that Hoffmann described a new genus: compare for instance Pfeiffer (Nomencl. bot. **2**: 366. 1874) and Murrill (*1903*: 89). Only species (descriptio generico-specifica): *Mucilago reticulata* Hoffm. It was first identified by Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 328, 385. 1821) as a variety of *Merulius fugax* Fr. per Fr. but farther on in the same work he referred to it as a distinct species, *Polyporus reticulatus* (Hoffm.) per Fr.[43] — It seems somewhat

[43] Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 385. 1821) cited "Nees syst. f. 225 [= 223]" and referred to synonyms under *Merulius fugax* Fr. per Fr. where he originally included *Mucilago reticulatus*. Nees (Syst. Pilze 223. 1816), in his turn, cited Hoffmann; moreover, he stated expressly that he had not seen the fungus himself; and reproduced Hoffmann's figure. If the name is to be typified by its original specimen (rather than one of Fries's), then it is evident that the name is to be cited as *Polyporus reticulatus* (Hoffm.) per Fr.

doubtful whether Hoffmann introduced a new genus, but on the other hand it is difficult to imagine that he could have meant *Mucilago* [Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 216. 1729] Adans. (Fam. Pl. **2**: 7. 1763), Haller, Scop., including Myxomycetes.

Muciporus Juel.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 84. 1957).

Mucronoporus Ell. & Ev. *in* J. Mycol. **5**: 28. March 1889. — ETYMOLOGY: mucro, -onis, sharp point; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus circinatus* Fr.—See under *Onnia*. — SCOPE. Introduced for the polypores possessing setae. Twelve species were listed, the first being *Polyporus circinatus*. — TYPIFICATION: The first species was indicated as type by Murrill (*1903:* 96, 100); the same species was suggested by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347). — Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 363. 1905) also listed *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr. as type species, perhaps because he identified *P. circinatus* with it (cf. *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 93. 1908). — W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 64) considered the name based upon *Polyporus balansae* Speg., the last species dealt with by Ellis & Everhart. I can see no reason for preferring this species to the one previously selected. According to Lloyd [Mycol. Notes **4** (Apus): 375. 1915] this South American species "= *Polyporus licnoides*, cotypes at Paris. Cotypes at Kew are rather *Polyporus gilvus*." — Previous to the above 'selections' *Mucronoporus* was emended as to include only setae-bearing species with d a r k spores by Romell [*in* Bih. K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl. (Afd. III) **26**: (16): 24, 14. 1901], and, therefore, the type species should preferably be one of the species retained in the emendated taxon. Romell did not indicate which of the original species he considered typical of the group he had in mind and none of them are dark-spored, hence his emendation cannot be invoked to select as type a different species from the above mentioned. — TYPONYM: *Onnia* P. Karst., published later in the same year.

M u l t i p o r u s R. & O. Falck *in* Hausschwammforsch. **12**: 32-41, 58. 1937[44] & *in* Trav. Inst. Rech. Forets dom., Warszawa A Nos. 36-38: 48–60, 81. 1938; (nomen

[44] I had the opportunity to consult the late Prof. R. Falck's only copy of the 'Heft' through the kind intermediance of Dr. F. Verdoorn, to whom Prof. Falck wrote (1946): "Dieser Druck war noch in Deutschland vom Verlage Gustav Fischer hergestellt, durfte aber nicht mehr herausgegeben werden [Title, R. & O. Falck, Die Ptychogasterfäule des Coniferenholzes.] . . . [Diese meine] letzte monographische Bearbeitung ist im Jahre 1938 von dem Forschungs-Institut der Polnischen Staatsforstverwaltung . . . in Deutscher und Polnischer Sprache herausgegeben worden. . . . Es ist anzunehmen, dass . . . die ganze Auflage der letzten Monographie, die in den No. 36, 37 und 38 (zugleich mit 2 anderen Arbeiten) der Traveaux et comptes rendus de l'Institut de Recherches des Forests Dominiales in Warzawa erschienen war, zerstört worden ist."

The Polish edition did appear, but I have not come across a second copy of Heft 12 of the "Hausschwammforschungen". However, a folder included in the Polish edition announces the appearance of both a German and a Polish edition: "Soeben erschienen. / In deutscher und in polnischer Sprache: Nr. 36, 37 und 38 Serie A der Arbeiten des Forschungs-Institutes der polnischer Staatsverwaltung . . .."

nudum). — Only original species: *Multiporus chlamydoformans* R. & O. Falck. — Not validly published: no Latin description.

Mycobonia Pat.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 85. 1957).

Mycodendrom.—See *Mycodendron.*
Mycodendron Mass.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 13. 1958).
Mycodendrum.—See *Mycodendron.*

Myriadoporus Peck *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **11**: 27. 1884. — ETYMOLOGY: μυριάς, -άδος, ten thousand, countless number; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species : *Myriadoporus adustus* Peck.—Now regarded as a monstrous form of *Polyporus adustus* (Willd.) per Fr.; compare Patouillard (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **5**: 84. 1889) and Murrill (*in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 40. 1907). — TYPONYM: *Bjerkandera* P. Karst. (1879). — STATUS. Impriorable as a nomen monstrositatis.

Myson.—See *Mison.*

Myxoporus Clem.—See *Muciporus.*

Nigrofomes Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 425. 1904; **32**: 369. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: niger, black; the genus *Fomes.* Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus melanoporus* Mont.—For a recent description, see Lowe (Polyp. N. Amer., Fomes 40. 1957) as *Fomes melanoporus* (Mont.) Cooke.

Nigroporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 361. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: niger, black; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus vinosus* Berk. = *Polyporus badius* Jungh. ex Bres. (preoccupied).

Nothotrechispora Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 69. 1944. — This name was mentioned in relation with *Byssocorticium* Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. It may be supposed that it was intended as a substitute for *Trechispora* P. Karst, as used in a former publication by Bondartsev & Singer, but that Singer ultimately took up *Phlebiella* P. Karst. instead and forgot to correct it under *Byssocorticum*, where *Nothotrechispora* should have been replaced, too, by *Phlebiella.* It was evidently printed by an oversight, and not being definitely accepted, it was not validly published.

Ochroporus J. Schroet. *in* Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1): 483. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: ὠχρός, pale, ochre; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus contiguus* (Pers.) per Fr. or *P. igniarius* (L.) per Fr. — SCOPE. The genus (counting

20 species as treated by Schroeter) was divided into three subgenera: (i) "*Poria* Persoon (in der Begrenzung von Karsten)", with 2 species; (ii) '*Apodoporinus* J. Schroet.' with 16 species; and (iii) "*Polystictus* (Fries). Karsten 1882", with 2 species. — TYPIFICATION. Donk (*1933:* 246) selected what was obviously the most eligible species of by far the largest subdivision, *Polyporus igniarius*. — Murrill (*1903:* 95, 100) considered the first species of the genus (one of the two species of the subgenus *Poria*), *Polyporus contiguus*, as type species; he was followed by Imazeki (*1943:* 57). W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 67) compromised by identifying *P. contiguus* with *P. igniarius* and listing the combined product as type species; the two fungi are very different. — HOMONYM. Compare *Scindalma* [Hill] O.K. (1898).

Oglioporus.—See *Oligoporus*.

Oligoporus Bref., Unters. Gesamtgeb. Mykol. **8**: 114. "1889" [1888]. — ETYMOLOGY: ὀλίγος, few; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Oligoporus farinosus* Bref.—This species was identified by Brefeld with *Ptychogaster citrinus* Boud., which in its turn has been referred to *Polyporus amorphus* Fr. per Fr., but this connexion seems still doubtful. — SCOPE.

"Von den drei bisher allein gefundenen und hierher gehörigen Formen ist *Oligoporus farinosus* nov. sp., welcher den *Ptychogaster citrinus* von Boudier als Clamydosporenfrucht einschliesst erschöpfend untersucht; *Oligoporus ustilaginoides* nov. sp., die zweite Form, zu welcher *Ptychogaster albus* gehört, bedarf noch der Ergänzung in der genauen Untersuchung des Hymeniums, und von der dritten Form, dem freilich noch fraglichen *Oligoporus rubescens* [45], sind die Hymenien noch nicht gefunden und daher die Beobachtungen auf die Cultur und die Untersuchung der Chlamydosporenfrüchte beschränkt geblieben."—Brefeld (op. cit., p. 117).

— TYPIFICATION. The above quotation clearly points to the first species, already indicated by Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 477. 1905), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 67), and Imazeki (*1943:* 57). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Oglioporus*"; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 67. 1953 (error).

Onnia P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 326. 1889 (German translation of Swedish description *in* Bot. Cbl. **43**: 383. 1890). — ETYMOLOGY: Onni Karsten. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus circinatus* Fr.—This and the one other species included, *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr., are sometimes regarded as conspecific; compare Lundell (*in* Lund. & Nannf., Fung. exs. suec. Fasc. 1–2: 22 No. 64. 1934) who combined the two, and Haddow (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **25**: 187. 1941) who kept *P. circinatus* as a variety of *P. tomentosus*. However, Gosselin (*in* Farlowia **1**: 528. 1944) maintained the two as distinct species. — SCOPE. Introduced with two Finnish species. — TYPIFICATION: *Polyporus circinatus*, the first species was indicated as type by Murrill (*1903:* 96, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**:

[45] "Der *Oligoporus rubescens* ist natürlich so lange keine sichere Form der Gattung, als die zugehörige Basidienfructification nicht gefunden ist. . . ."

363. 1905), W. C. Cooke (*1940:* 95; *1953:* 68), and Imazeki (*1943:* 57). — TYPONYM. *Mucronoporus* Ell. & Ev. (1889, prior to *Onnia* according to Murrill, *1903:* 96).

Osmoporus Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 67. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: ὀσμή, odour; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Trametes odorata* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. — SCOPE. Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 54) at first reintroduced the name *Ceratophora* Humb., q.v., for this genus, but Singer soon dropped it to substitute it by *Osmoporus*, while Bondartsev (*1953:* 40, 279) preferred *Anisomyces* Pilát, q.v. Two species were mentioned. — TYPONYMS: *Ceratophora* Humb. per Corda (1842; nomen monstrositatis vel anamorphosis) and *Anisomyces* Pilát (1936; not validly published, preoccupied). Compare also *Ceriomyces* Corda (1837; not *Ceriomyces* Murrill).

Ovinus Lloyd Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot. **18**: 121. 1920; **22**: 13. 1926. — ETYMOLOGY: the specific epithet of the name *Polyporus ovinus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus ovinus* (Schaeff.) per Fr. — BASINYM: [*Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Carnosi* Fr., Epicr. 428. 1838; *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori ovini* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 48. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 32); *Polyporus* sect. *Ovini* Cooke *in* Grevillea **13**: 80. 1884;] *Polyporus* sect. *Ovinus* Lloyd. Mycol. Writ. **3** (Syn. Ovin.): 71. 1911.—"Cette section des Polyporées que Mr. Lloyd a empruntée à Fries . . .." — Torrend (op. cit., p. 13). — VALID PUBLICATION: This happened in a key to the genera of stipitate polypores (1920). When, in his monograph of the Brazilian species of this group, Torrend arrived at the treatment of the genus he preferred the name *Polyporus*, adding *Ovinus* in parentheses (1926). See also notes under *Lentus*. — SCOPE. Torrend completely identified his genus with Lloyd's section. — TYPIFICATION. Fries's type species, after which the whole group was called, is here selected as the obvious choice. — REMARK. See for other details under *Lentus*. — TYPONYMS: *Albatrellus* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Caloporus* Quél. (1886; preoccupied).

Oxyporus (Bourd. & G.) Donk, Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. **2**: 202. 1933. — ETYMOLOGY: ὄξύς, sharp; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Polyporus connatus* Weinm. — BASINYM: *Coriolus* sect. *Oxyporus* Bourd. & G. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **41**: 139. 1925; Hym. France 560. "1927" [1928].—The original species (including *Polyporus obducens* Pers.) is *P. connatus* = *P. populinus* Fr.[46] — SCOPE: Two species were treated by Donk.

Oxyuria.—See *Oxyuris*.

Oxyuris "McGinty"; Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **4** (Fom.): 261. 1915 (not validly published). — For some general remarks on the McGinty names (not validly published), see Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 205. 1951).

---

[46] Mentioned by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 69) as "*Boletus populinus* Schw."

"Lloyd, more or less facetiously, suggests this name for polypores with the peculiar imbedded cystidia or setae characteristic of *Fomes pachyphloeus* Pat., which species would become the type. Later (Myc. Writ. **4**: L. 54, 7, Jan. 1915) he suggests that *Poria weirii* belongs to the genus, citing it, however, as *Oxyuria* rather than *Oxyuris*. The name may be ignored since Lloyd did not use it except for the above brief mention. Furthermore the name has been preempted by *Oxyuris* Linstow Centr. Bakt. **44**: 265, 1907."—Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 95. 1936).

Pelloporus Quél., Ench. Fung. 166. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: πελλός, dark coloured; πόρος, pore. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr.

SCOPE. The genus is about the same as *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Subcoriacei* Fr. (Hym. europ. 530. 1874) = *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Biennis* Fr. [Epicr. 434. 1838; *Polyporus biennis* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr. not included here!] = *Polystictus* stirps *Polysticti perennis* Fr. (*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 71. 1851 = Nov. Symb. 55 — *Polystictus* sect. *Perennes* Cooke *in* Grevillea **14**: 77. 1886; this relation was not especially indicated by Quélet, but it is undeniable that he raised this Friesian taxon to generic rank. He treated seven species, of which the first is *Polyporus triqueter* (Pers. per Schw.) Pers. sensu Secr. and one of the others, *P. perennis*. With the exclusion of *P. xoilopus* Rostk. (the last species), the genus comprized two small groups of which *P. perennis* and *P. tomentosus* Fr. may be taken as representatives.

TYPIFICATION. My preference in view of the genesis of the genus is *Polyporus perennis*, type species of the Friesian section that was raised to generic rank. This was evidently also Patouillard's view (Essai taxon. Hym. 100. 1900 when he cited *Pelloporus* as a synonym of *Xanthochrous* sect. *Perennes* "Fr." See also Torrend, cited below.

Murrill (*1903:* 95, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 341. 1904; **32**: 363. 1905) took Quélet's first species, *Polyporus triqueter*. This species does not appear to be eligible. Quélet placed his genus in his series Mesopodes, and an eligible species should be centrally stipitate. *Polyporus triqueter* was assimilated presumably because of its undeniable relationship to the species following, *P. tomentosus*, but not because it was centrally stipitate: compare "Pileo . . . postice porrecto" of Quélet's specific description (and ". . . stipite laterali" for the variety '*corrugis*')! The only reasonable alternative choice to *P. perennis* would have been, I believe, *P. tomentosus*. Murrill was followed by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96: *1953:* 71), and Imazeki (*1943:* 58, "*Polyporus triqueter* sens. Quél. [non Fr.]"); and also by Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 54; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66); Bondartsev [*1953:* 40, who indicated "*P. corrugis* (Fr.) . . . (= *P. triqueter* Quél.)"; *Polyporus corrugis* Fr. was included by Quélet as a variety of *P. triqueter*]; and Kotloba & Pouzar [*1957:* 158; "*Pelloporus triqueter* s. Quél. (= *Polyporus Trogii*)" and op. cit., p. 168, "= *Fomes corrugis* (Fr.) Sacc."].

'HOMONYM' & SYNISONYM: *Pelloporus* (Lloyd) Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920; **22**: 6. 1926. — Basinym: *Polystictus* sect. *Pelloporus* (Quél.) Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3** (Pol. Iss. No. 1): 1. 1912.—Lloyd made a section of Quélet's genus,

but Torrend, who was apparently unaware of the existence of Quélet's genus, restored it again to generic rank and (Torrend, op. cit., p. 6) explicity cited Lloyd's sectional name as basinym. See also "Remarks" under *Lentus*. — Type species: "Comme *P. perennis* en est l'espece principale [of *Pelloporus*] de l'Europe, Fries avait formé le groupe de *Perennes*."—Torrend (op. cit., p. 6).

VARIANT SPELLING: "*Phelloporus*": P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 325. 1889 as a synonym ; P. Syd. *in* Sacc., Syll. Fung. **12**: 512. 1897 (as a synonym). — TYPONYMS: *Coltricia* S. F. Gray (1821), *Polystictus* Fr. (1851), *Xanthochrous* Pat. (1897), and compare *Volvopolyporus* Lloyd ex Sacc. & Trott. (1912).

Perenniporia Murrill *in* Mycologia **34**: 595. 1942. — ETYMOLOGY: perennis, perennial; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus unitus* Pers.—I do not know how Murrill interpreted this species, but the type specimen of the latter name is the same fungus which is often called *Poria medulla-panis* (Jacq.) Pers. See further under *Poria*. — SCOPE. Two species were mentioned. No type species indicated! — TYPIFICATION. According to the code followed by Murrill it seems appropriate to consider the first species the type, as was done by W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 71). — TYPONYM: *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray (1821).

Persooniana Britz. *in* Bot. Cbl. **71**: 88. 1897. — ETYMOLOGY: C. H. Persoon. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Persooniana albocana* Britz.—Judging from the description and the separately published illustration, this might perhaps be a species of *Tyromyces* P. Karst. (= *Postia* Fr.). I do not agree with a suggestion by Killermann (*in* Denkschr. bay. bot. Ges. **15**: 47. 1922): "Halte ich für *Irpex fusco-violaceus* mit den gekrümmten Sporen."

Petaloides (Lloyd *ex* Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920; **21**: 17. 1924. — ETYMOLOGY: πέταλον, leaf; -οειδής, resembling. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus petaloides* Fr.—The identity of this species has not yet been settled; compare, however, Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 528. 1928), who regarded it as a form of their *Melanopus varius* subsp. *nummularius* (Bull. per Fr.) Bourd. & G.; and Pilát (*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 109. 1937), who made it a subform of *Polyporellus varius* (Pers. per Fr.) P. Karst. — BASINYM: [*Polyporus* stirps *Polypori petaloidis* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 51. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 35);] *Polyporus* sect. *Petaloides* Cooke *in* Grevillea **13**: 82. 1885; "Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Petaloides* Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 100, 129. 1912.—"Continuant à suivre Mr. Lloyd dans ses Stipitate Polyporoids nous considérerons dans le genre *Petaloides* . . .."—Torrend (op. cit., p. 17). — VALID PUBLICATION. First validly published as a generic name in a key (1920); afterwards the Brazilian species were monographically treated (1924). See also notes under *Lentus*. — TYPIFICATION. If one accepts Lloyd's section and Torrend's genus as the same taxon as Fries's stirps, then the type species of all three names should be *Polyporus petaloides:* compare Fries (*l.c.*), "Typus est europaeus *P. petaloides*"!

Phaeocoriolellus Kotlaba & Pouz. *in* Česká Mykol. **11**: 162. 1957. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dark, obscure; the genus *Coriolellus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Daedalea trabea* (Pers.) per Fr.

Phaeodaedalea "McGinty"; Lloyd, Mycol. Notes **4** (Lett. 4): 9. 1913 (not validly published).

"This is another of the taxonomic pleasantries of the late Prof. N. J. McGinty and is 'based on globose, coloured spores.' The genus (sic) is referred to on several occasions (Myc. Writ. **4**: L. 44: 9, Jan. 1913: **4**: L. 60: 15, Dec. 1915; **5**: L. 65: 14, March 1917), *Daedalea Sprucei* being the type assigned. Except for the above fleeting references, the name was not used by Lloyd in formal publication, in labelling specimens in his collections, or elsewhere as far as known."—Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 95. 1936).

See also Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 205. 1951) for some general remarks on the "McGinty" names, which are not validly published. – Another species associated by Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **4** (Lett. 60): 15. 1915] with this name is *Daedalea guyoniana* Mont., which is, according to Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **18**: 69. 1920), *Hexagona nitida* Dur. & Mont. fa. *trametoidea*.

Phaeolopsis Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 489. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Phaeolus*; ὄφις, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus verae-crucis* Berk. ex Cooke apud Sacc.—According to Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **14**: 228. 1916 this is a synonym of *Polyporus luteonitidus* Berk.

Phaeolus (Pat.) Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 86. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dark, obscure. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus schweinitzii* Fr. — BASINYM: [*Polyporus?*] subgen. *Phaeolus* Pat. *in* Ann. Jard. bot. Buitenzorg Suppl. **1**: 112. 1897.—Introduced on the occasion of the description of *P*[*olyporus?*] *javanicus* Pat., "Espèce voisine de *P. vallatus* Berk. et de *P. Schweinitzii* Fr." — SCOPE. When he introduced the genus, Patouillard mentioned 13 species (of which some would now be included in *Hapalopilus* P. Karst.). The first one was *Polyporus schweinitzii*. — TYPIFICATION. Of the three species described or mentioned when the (not validly published?) basinym was introduced, *Polyporus schweinitzii*, the only European one, was doubtless the one best known to the author. It has been unanimously considered type species of the generic name: Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 362. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 90. 1908), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 55; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96; *1953:* 72), Imazeki (*1943:* 59), and Bondartsev (*1953:* 41). — TYPONYMS: *Romellia* Murrill (1904), *Spongiosus* (Lloyd) ex Torrend (1920), and *Choriphyllum* Velen. (1922).

Phaeoporus J. Schroet. *in* Krypt.-Fl. Schles. **3** (1): 489. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: φαιός, dark; πόρος, pore. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES selected): *Polyporus obliquus* (Pers.) per Fr. or *P. cuticularis* (Bull.) per Fr.

SCOPE. The genus was divided into three subgenera: (i) '*Phaeoporella* J. Schroet.', with one species, *Polyporus obliquus*; (ii) '*Apodoporella* J. Schroet.', with four species, *Polyporus cuticularis* being the first; and (iii) '*Pleuroporella* J. Schroet.', with one species, *Polyporus lucidus* (Leyss.) per Fr. (genus *Ganoderma* P. Karst.).

TYPIFICATION. Originally Murrill (*1903:* 96, 100) took "*P*[*haeoporus*] *obliquus* (Pers.)", Schroeter's first species, as type; he was followed in this by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96; *1953:* 73) and Imazeki (*1943:* 59).

Later Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 362, 1905) regarded *Polyporus cuticularis* as type species (no reasons stated). This indication is preferable since it picked out an outstanding member of the largest subgenus.

Previous to these species being taken as type, the genus was reserved by Romell [*in* Bih. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl. (Afd. III) **26** (16): 26, and footnote on p. 14. 1901] "für den nicht hymenochaeteartigen, dunkelsporigen, ungestielten Species", in which, in addition, the spores were not of the *Ganoderma*-type. Of the six original species, *Polyporus obliquus*, *P. cuticularis*, and *P. hispidus* (Bull.) per Fr. possess setae; *Polyporus vegetus* Fr. and *P. lucidus* Leyss. per Fr., have spores of the *Ganoderma*-type, that is with truncate apex: and *Polyporus lucidus*, in addition to having *Ganoderma* spores, is also stalked. Thus, all original species were directly or indirectly excluded by Romell and, hence, no type can be selected to conform to his emendation!

HOMONYM: *Phaeoporus* Bataille (1908; Boletaceae). — TYPONYMS. Compare *Inonotus* P. Karst. (1879) and *Polystictoides* Lázaro (1916).

Phaeotrametes "McGinty": Lloyd, Myc. Writ. **4** (Pol. Ap.): 356. June 1915; **4** (Lett. 60): 11. Dec. 1915 (not validly published).

"Lloyd transfers *Hexagona decipiens* Berk. to *Polyporus* remarking in passing that, "Properly it is a 'new genus,' *Phaeotrametes* McGinty, on the same principle (colored spores) that other similar new genera, *Phaeoradulum*, *Phaeocyphella*, etc., were manufactured." Later, he states that the species which he describes as new as *Polyporus deceptivus* 'by rights goes in McGinty's genus *Phaeotrametes*.' The name was not used in labelling specimens."—Stevenson & Cash (*in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 95. 1936).

See also Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 205. 1951) for some general remarks on the "McGinty" names, which were not definitely accepted by their publishing author and hence not validly published.

Phellinus Quél., Ench. Fung. 172. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: φέλλινος, made of cork. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus rubriporus* Quél. = *Polyporus torulosus* (Pers.) per Pers.

SCOPE. Introduced with six species, in this order: *Polyporus igniarius* (L.) per Fr., *P. rubriporus*, *P. fulvus* "Fr.", *P. conchatus* (Pers.) per Fr., *P. pectinatus* Klotzsch (sensu Quél.), and *P. salicinus* (Pers.) per Fr. sensu Fr. (1838).

TYPIFICATION. The first species, *Polyporus igniarius*, has been generally adopted as type, for instance by Murrill (*1903:* 95, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 369. 1905), Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 158, 175. 1941), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 56; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 73; "*Agaricus igniarius* Batt."), W. B. Cooke & Shaw (*in* Res. Stud. Coll. Washington **20**: 17. 1952), Imazeki (*1943:* 59), and Bondartsev (*1953:* 42).

However, the 'residue-method' prevents this choice, since in 1888 Quélet (Fl. mycol. 399) excluded *Polyporus igniarius* (as well as *P. fulvus*), and transferred it to *Placodes* Quél.; the type species should be selected from the remainder of the original species, and I herewith choose *Polyporus rubriporus* as such.

HOMONYM. *Phelline* Labill. (1824; Rutaceae; cf. Index kewensis; gender, f.) should apparently not be considered a homonym, both the termination and gender of the name being different. — *Phellinus* Quél. was rejected as a later homonym of *Phelline* Poir. (1826 [= Labill., 1824]) by Murrill and Donk (*1933:* 247). For this reason the first of these authors replaced it by *Pyropolyporus* Murrill, q.v., while the second felt obliged to take up *Ochroporus* J. Schroet.

REMARK. Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 158, 175. 1941) proposed *Phellinus* Quél. as a nomen conservandum against "*Poria* Pers. ex P. A. Karst." This was before it had been made acceptable that *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray (1821) was validly published. When this happened the proposal was withdrawn as superfluous (Donk, op. cit. **18**: 101. 1949).

ISONYM: *Pyropolyporus* Murrill (1903), q.v.

Phelloporus.—See *Pelloporus.*

Pherima.—See *Phorima.*

Phisisporinus.—See *Physisporinus.*

Phomes.—See *Fomes.*

Phorima Rafin. *per* Steud., Nom. bot. Pl. crypt. 332. 1824 ("*Phorina*"); Rafin., Med. Fl. **2**: 201. 1830; *in* Loudon, Gdnrs' Mag. **8**: 248. 1832[47]; Fl. tellur. **1**: 34. "1836" [1837]. — ETYMOLOGY: "Zus. aus φερειν (tragen) und ἱμα (Kleid, Seihetuch) . . ."—Wittstein, Etym.-bot. HandwB. 684. 1852. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Phorima betulina* Rafin.—This species has as yet not been identified. I do not recognize it from Rafinesque's unpublished plate 5 (mentioned by Gerard *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **12**: 37. 1885). — DEVALIDATED NAME: *Phorima* Rafin. *in* Med. Repos., New York, 2nd Hex., **3**: 423. 1806 (nomen nudum); **5**: 355. 1808; Précis

[47] The title of the paper reads, "Remarks on the Encyclopaedia of Plants of Loudon, Lindley, and Sowerby." The paper was reprinted by Britten (*in* J. Bot., Lond. **8**: 224–229. 1900; *Phorima* on p. 288) and also appeared in a German translation [*in* Linnaea **8** (Litt.-Ber.): 66–75. 1833; *Phorima* on p. 73].

Découv. somiol. 49. 1814; *in* J. Bot. (ed. Desvaux), Paris **4**: 275. 1814; *in* Am. monthly Mag. Crit. Rev. **4**: 208. 1819 (nomen; "*Pherima*"); Anal. Nat. ou Tabl. Univ. 211. 1815 (nomen). — The generic descriptions runs:

"*Phorima* . . . resembling the sessile *Boletus*, but bearing underneath small concave cavities instead of pores. Found in different states [of the U.S.A.]."—Rafinesque (l.c., 1808).

"*Phorima*: stipe nulle, péride déprimé, portant en-dessous des fossetes."—Rafinesque [*in* J. Bot. (ed. Desvaux), Paris **4**: 275. 1814].

The original species are *Phorima betulina* Rafin. (first species), *P. boletoides* Rafin., and *P. difformis* Rafin., all nomina nuda. Afterwards a fourth species was described, *P. minuta* Rafin. [*in* J. Bot. ed. Desvaux), Paris **4**: 275. 1814]: "Dimidié, blanchâtre, glabre, fossètes arrondies égales. Amér. Septentrionale." On this occasion Desvaux remarked of *Phorima:* "C'est le genre *Favolus* de Palisot de Beauvois." — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. The first author to deal with *Phorima* after January 1, 1821 was, perhaps Steudel (l.c.) who added "*Favolus*. Beauv. (sec. Desv.)" as a synonym, and listed one species. *P. minuta*. He validly published the name merely by a reference consisting of the author's citation "Rafin."). — Reichenbach (Consp. Regni veg. 15. 1828 listed it as "*Phorima*. Rafin. (Boletac.)" among his "Fungorum genera: / b. ulterius inquirenda." In my opinion he did not accept the genus in a taxonomic sense (name not preceeded by a number), but listed it purely as a matter of record. — In 1830 Rafinesque definitely accepted the genus: "[Fungi] with cells beneath are my G. *Phorima*", differentiating it from *Boletus* L. which he characterizes as "Fungi with pores beneath". In Rafinesque's comment of 1832, too, an accompanying description is to be found: the paragraph runs, "My genus *Phorima*, 1814, for *Boletus*, with irregular cells, omitted [from the work discussed by Rafinesque]; and many other genera of my pamphlet, 1814. [Précis des Découvertes Somiologiques, &c.]." Moreover, there is a reference to an earlier description. (The title between square brackets was added to the original paper by J. Denson.) In 1837 the name is merely listed ("*Phorima* Raf."), as a genus of "Boletidia", but again definitely accepted. — The manner of re-publication implies that the scope of the genus of 1824 must be taken as that of the original publication of 1808. — TYPIFICATION. Murrill (*1903:* 90) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 74) appointed *Phorima betulina* as type, the first of the original species of 1808. — VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Phorina*"; Steud., l.c.—An error. — "*Pherima*"; Rafin., l.c., 1819.—Presumably an error.

Phyllodontia P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **22**: 163. 1883. — ETYMOLOGY: φύλλον, leaf; the genus *Odontia*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Phyllodontia magnusii* P. Karst. = *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr.—The type might be (and has been) considered an abnormal form of *Daedalea unicolor*, but it seems abnormal only in so far in that it is apparently an extreme condition of a characteristic tendency (hymenophore rupturing into flattened teeth) not unusual in this species. Compare also Lloyd (Mycol. Writ. **3**: 451. 1910) and Lowe (*in* Mycologia **48**: 109. 1956). — TYPONYMS: *Cerrena* S. F. Gray (1821), *Sistotrema* Pers. per Nocca & Balbis (1821; preoccupied), and *Bulliardia* Lázaro (1916).

Phylloporia Murrill *in* Torreya **4**: 141. 1904. — ETYMOLOGY: φύλλον, leaf; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Phylloporia parasitica* Murrill.

Physisporinus P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 324. 1889 (German translation of the Swedish description *in* Bot. Cbl. **43**: 383. 1890). — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Physisporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): "*Poria vitrea* Pers." ("*Polyporus vitreus* Fr.") sensu P. Karst. —Judging from Karsten's description, this is not *Polyporus vitreus* (Pers.) per Fr. sensu Fr., which is apparently *Polyporus undatus* Pers.; the spores as described by Karsten are quite different. Baxter [*in* Pap. Michigan Acad. Sci. **28** (1): 217. 1943] identified part of a collection named by Karsten as *Physisporinus vitreus* Pers., as "*Polyporus pallescens* Karst., *p. p.* (non Fries), ex Romell Hymen. Lap., [*in* Ark. Bot. **11** (3):] p. 19. 1911." Romell's species in its turn has been identified with *Polyporus semisupinus* Berk. & C. apud Berk. (cf. Lowe *in* Mycologia **48**: 119. 1956). However, this small-spored fungus presumably is very different from Karsten's type material of *Physisporinus* of which he described the spores as, "ovala, stundom sneda och stötande n.i. gult, 6–9 = 4 mm." — REMARK. To me *Physisporinus* is still a nomen dubium, not a synonym of *Podoporia* P. Karst. (1892) sensu Höhn. and hence not the correct name for the latter genus to which it was applied by Pilát (*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 247. 1939). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Phisisporinus*"; *in* Bot. Cbl. **43**: 383. 1890 (incidental mention).

Physisporus Chev., Fl. gén. Ev. Paris **1**: 261. 1826. — ETYMOLOGY: φύσις, nature; πόρος, pore. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus medulla-panis* (Jacq.) per Fr. [pr. p. = *Poria medulla-panis* (Jacq.) Pers. sensu Pers.—For the latter species see under *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray.].

SCOPE. This was, when introduced, a superfluous name for *Poria* Pers.: Chevallier cited in synonymy "*Polypori* spec. Fries. . . . *Poria*. Hill. Pers. *Resupinati*. Nees. Fries." Described are nine species; *Polyporus obliquus* (Pers.) per Fr. is the first, and one of the others, *Polyporus medulla-panis* (Jacq.) per Fr. Two of the species [*Polyporus obliquus* and *P. salicinus* (Pers.) per Fr.] may be set off from the remainder as the dark coloured element of the genus, that was afterwards excluded and transferred to *Poria* "Pers." by Kasten (see under *Poria*).

TYPIFICATION. *Physisporus* was not a new genus, but merely a new name for "*Poria*. Hill. Pers. [*Polypori*] *Resupinati*. Nees. Fries." The reason why Chevallier rejected the name *Poria* and substituted it by *Physisporus* is not clear. One would invoke here the principle that the mere change of a name does not alter the type and, therefore, feel obliged to adopt in this case *Poria medulla-panis* (Jacq.) Pers. sensu Pers. as type.[48] The latter species was included as a synonym of *Physisporus medulla-panis* (Pers. per Fr.) Chev. sensu Fries: Chevallier's description of that

[48] See also foot-note 52.

species was adopted from Fries's *Polyporus medulla-panis* (Syst. mycol. **1**: 380. 1821), which is now often thought to be different from Persoon's *Poria medulla-panis*, but see page 266 of the present paper. It was not Chevallier's intention to include in particular the Swedish fungus in his flora of Paris.

Some ten years later Chevallier (Fung. Ill., text to unnumbered plate, species no. 41 according to index. 1837) depicted "*Physisporus radula* . . . (*Boletus radula* Pers. syn. . . . *Polyporus radula* Fries . . .." as an example of the genus. It is not clear why he choose this species to illustrate *Physisporus*, but judging from the rest of the work it may be valued as an arbitrary selection. The identity of the depicted fungus is doubtful.

Physisporus was taken up in its original broad sense by Gillet (Champ. France, Hym. 693. 1878) and a few subsequent authors. Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 18. 1881) restricted it to the white and pale coloured species.

Murrill (*1903:* 91, 100) and W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 75) took the name as based on Chevallier's first species, *Polyporus obliquus*. This is not acceptable after consideration of the historical data presented above (for instance, Karsten's emendation of 1881, by which *P. obliquus* was excluded and referred to *Poria* Pers. per P. Karst. 1881, see p. 268 . Accepting *P. obliquus* as type would make *Physisporus* the correct name for *Inonotus* P. Karst. *sensu lato* (at present considered by several mycologists to be the correct name for *Xanthochrous* Pat. emend. Bourd. & G.).

REMARK. See also under *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray (1821). — VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Physoporus*": Endl., Gen. Pl. 39. 1836 & Pfeiffer, Nom. bot **2**: 705. 1874 (as a synonym). — "*Physosporus*"; *in* Rev. mycol. **5**: 127. 1883. — TYPONYM (basinym): *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray (1821).

Physoporus.—See *Physisporus.*
Physosporus.—See *Physisporus.*

Picnoporus.—See *Pycnoporus.*

Piptoporus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 17. Jan. 1, 1881 (nomen nudum); *in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6**: 9. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: πίπτω, I fall (off); πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus betulinus* (Bull.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Published in the "Revue mycologique" with one species only, *Polyporus betulinus*, but the valid publication, in the "Meddelanden" (l.c.) listed three species as examples of which *P. betulinus* is the first. — TYPIFICATION. *Polyporus betulinus* has been unanimously accepted as type species: Murrill (*1903:* 94, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **30**: 424. 1903; **32**: 473. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 44. 1907), who identified it with *Boletus suberosus* L.); Donk (*1933:* 140); Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 53; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66); W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87, as "*Agaricus suberosus* L."; *1953:* 76); Imazeki (*1943:* 60); Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 30. 1948); Bondartsev (*1953:* 39-40); and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 168). — TYPONYMS: *Ungularia* Lázaro (1916) and *Placoderma* (Ricken) Ulbrich (1928).

Placoderma (Ricken) Ulbrich *in* Lindau, KryptFl. Anfänger **1** (3. Aufl.): 159. 1928. — ETYMOLOGY: πλάξ, -ακός, plate: δέρμα, skin. Gender: n.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus betulinus* (Bull.) per Fr.

BASINYM: *Placodes* [sect.?] 3. *Placoderma* Ricken, Vadem. Pilzfr. 226. 1918 ["(Fr.)"].—The species included by Ricken are, in this order: *Polyporus betulinus*, *P. quercinus* (Schrad.) per Fr., *P. officinalis* (Vill.) per Fr., *P. helveolus* Rostk., *P. erubescens* Fr., *P. resinosus* (Schrad.) per Fr. (sensu Fr.), and *P. dryadeus* (Pers.) per Fr. These demonstrate that Ricken's taxon is the same as *Polyporus* B. *Placodermei* Fr. sect. *Suberosi* Fr., Epicr. 460. 1838, Hym. europ. 553. 1874 (order of species inverted). The author's citation for *Placodes* section *Placoderma* should not be given as "(Fr.)" as was done by Ricken. *Polyporus* B. *Placodermei* Fr. is based on *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr. (see under *Placodes* Quél.) which was not included by Ricken, and, therefore, one cannot adopt *Placodes* section *Placoderma* as typonym or isonym of *Polyporus* B. *Placodermei* Fr.; it should rather be taken as an isonym (or typonym) of *Polyporus* sect. *Suberosi* Fr. — I am unable to find any clear relationship between Ricken's name and *Trametes* subgen. *Placoderma* Fr. (*in* K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl. **1848**: 134) = *Polystictus* subgen. *Placoderma* (Fr.) Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 94. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 78).

VALID PUBLICATION. It may well be that this generic name had been validly published before, for several German authors at about that time acted as if this were indeed the case. A more likely solution for this behaviour may be that the typographic difference of Ricken's infrageneric epithet with a true generic name in the same work is so slight. Gramberg (Pilze Heim., 3. Aufl., **2**: text to *pl. 25*. 1921) cited "*Placoderma bet.*" as a synonym of *Polyporus betulinus*. Compare also B. Hennig (Führ. Pilzfr. **3**: No. 295. 1927), who, in the year preceding Ulbrich's publication of the name, gave a full description of *Polyporus betulinus* under the name of *Placoderma betulinum* Bull., but he did not supply a generic description. This, together with the fact that he evidently had no intention to introduce a new genus, seems sufficient reason not to construct a generic name *Placoderma* published by Hennig by means of a descriptio generico-specifica. Such a generic name would not be validly published since the species was not a new one.

SCOPE. Ulbrich took up Ricken's taxon unaltered.

TYPIFICATION. Three of Ricken's original species may be taken into consideration in this respect, *Polyporus betulinus*, *P. officinalis*, and *P. dryadeus*. Of these, the second is a very important one, especially from a historical point of view, but it must be discarded for it is not with "einer pergamentartigen Haut überzogen", as the original description of the group has it: Ricken stated that *P. officinalis* was supplied with "harter rissig-abschülfernder Haut". The crust (skin) in *P. betulinus*, however, is stated to be parchment-like, and since this agrees better than "mit einer dünner brüchigen Haut" in the case of *P. dryadeus*, I select herewith *P. betulinus* as type species. It also agrees very well with Ulbrich's generic description in which it is stated that the fruit-bodies are covered with a "pergamentartiger od. harziger Haut".

REMARK. Ulbrich erroneously ascribed the genus to Fries: "3. Gattung: *Placoderma* Fries, Hautporling," mislead by Ricken's caption, "[*Placodes*] 3. *Placoderma* (Fr.) Hautporlinge." As already explained Fries's name must be dropped in the author's citation.

TYPONYMS: *Piptoporus* P. Karst. (1881) and *Ungularia* Lázaro (1916).

Placodes Quél., Ench. Fung. 170. 1886. — ETYMOLOGY: πλακώδης, flat. Gender: f., treated as m. by Quélet. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr. — SCOPE. The genus corresponds to *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* B. *Placodermei* Fr. (Epicr. 460. 1838; Hym. europ. 553. 1874), enlarged by the addition of the first species, *Polyporus lucidus* (Leyss.) per Fr. (see under *Fomes* in the present paper), and with the exclusion of a relatively small distinct genus, *Phellinus* Quél., q.v. Quélet's subdivisions and the order of his species are as in Fries's "Hymenomycetes europaei"; the sections are even called by the same epithets: 'Suberosi', 'Fomentarii', and 'Lignosi'! — TYPIFICATION. Obviously the most eligible species are the type species of the names of the three Friesian sections included. For the second section this is, inescapably, *P. fomentarius*; for the two others a type species is not as easily selected, but in any case *P. fomentarius* would be the most outstanding one of the three. Patouillard's emendation (Hym. Eur. 139. 1887) of *Placodes*, which consisted of reducing it to only a part of *Placodes* sect. *Fomentarii* (Fr.) Quél., with the exclusion of *P. fomentarius* transferred to *Fomes* Fr.), can hardly lead to the selection of another species because this emendation bears the stamp of a misapplication. — The first-species rule has provided us with the indication of *Polyporus lucidus*, precisely the one and only species not included by Fries in his 'Placodermei'. It is aberrant ("Pileo stipiteque laccatis . . ."), in Quélet's genus which belongs to his series Apodes ("Sessiles basi dilatata . . .").[49] Thus it does not seem eligible for consideration. It was considered type species by Murrill (*1903:* 95, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 490. 1905) and W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96; *1953:* 76) who identified it with *Boletus flabelliformis* Scop.; and by Imazeki (*1943:* 60). — TYPONYMS: *Agaricoigniarium* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Pyreium* Paul. (circa 1820; devalidated name), *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. (1849), *Ungulina* Pat. (1900), *Elfvingiella* Murrill (1914), and compare also *Xylopilus* P. Karst. (1882; nomen monstrositatis?).

Podoporia P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **31**: 297. 1892; Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 2: 23. 1893 [*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **54**: 177. 1894]. — ETYMOLOGY: πούς, ποδός, foot; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Podoporia confluens* P. Karst. —According to von Höhnel [*in* S.B. Akad. Wiss. Wien (Math.-nat. Kl., Abt. I) **118**: 442. 1909] this is a synonym of *Polyporus* (*Poria*) *sanguinolentus* (A. & S.) per Fr. The description agrees well with this sug-

[49] In the generic description this character is not repeated; in fact nothing is stated about the shape and attachment of the fruit-body and the latter must be taken to comply in these respects with the description of the series.

gestion. However, Lowe (*in* Mycologia **48**: 116. 1956), who studied material from Karsten's herbarium, suggests with reservations that it might belong to *Polyporus pannocinctus* Romell = *Poria pannocincta* (Romell) Lowe. — REMARK. Singer (*1944:* 66) mentioned the type species as "*P*[*odoporia*] *sanguinolenta* (Alb. & Schw.) Hoehn."

Pogonomyces Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 609. 1904; **32**: 360. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: πώγων, -ωνος, beard; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species definitely included): *Boletus hydnoides* Sw. = *Polyporus hydnoides* (Sw.) per Fr.—For a recent description, see Overholts (*1953:* 397). — SCOPE. A second species was mentioned under the heading "Species inquirendae".

Poliporus.—See *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.
Polyphorus.—See *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.

[*Polyplocium* Berk. — Sometimes referred to the Polyporaceae, but unsually placed among the Gastromycetes.]

Polypilus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 17. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: πολύς, many; πῖλος, cap. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus frondosus* (Dicks.) per Fr. — SCOPE. Three Finnish species were indicated as belonging here. — TYPIFICATION. The first species has been considered type by Murrill (*1903:* 93, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 481. 1905), Donk (*1933:* 121), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 47 [50]), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96; *1953:* 78), Imazeki *1943:* 60 , and Bondartsev (*1953:* 52). See also discusson under *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill.! — SYNISONYMS & TYPONYMS: *Merisma* (Fr.) Gill. (1878) and *Cladomeris* Quél. (1886) are rather synisonyms of *Polypilus*; *Grifola* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Cladodendron* Lázaro (1916 ; and compare *Flabellaria* Chev. (1826; not validly published).

Polyporellus P. Karst. *in* Meded. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 37. "1880" (reprint, 1879) (and cf. *in* Rev. mycol. **2**: 137. 1880). — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Polyporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus brumalis* (Pers.) per Fr. — SCOPE. The name was introduced for three of Fries's stirpes, viz. *Polyporus* stirps *Polypori lenti*, stirps *P. melanopodis*, and stirps *P. petaloidis* (Fries *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 48–53. 1851 — Nov. Symb. 32–37) as is plainly indicated by the 30 examples listed, which were all treated or briefly mentioned in Fries's cited work. Of the examples listed, the first one-third is European, the rest extra-European species. First species, *Polyporus brumalis*. — TYPIFICATION. I consider as most eligible the type species of the three stirpes names: *Polyporus brumalis* (see under *Lentus*), *P. melanopus* (Pers.) per Fr., and *P. petaloides* Fr. (see under *Petaloides*). Of these the

---

[50] Singer (*1944:* 69) indicated "*P*[*olypilus*] *ramosissimus* (Dicks.) Karst."; this seems to be a *lapsus calami*.

first has already been indicated by Murrill (*1903:* 93, 100, identified with *Boletus polyporus* Retz.; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 484. 1905), W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96; *1953:* 78), Imazeki (*1943:* 60), and Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 23. 1948). — TYPONYMS: *Leucoporus* Quél. (1886) and *Lentus* (Lloyd) Torrend (1920).

Polyporellus "Gilbert".—See *Porphyrellus* E. J. Gilb., Boletaceae (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 297. 1955).

Polyporoletus Snell *in* Mycologia **28**: 467. 1936. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Polyporus*; the genus *Boletus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Polyporoletus sublividus* Snell.—Compare Singer, Snell, & White (*in* Mycologia **37**: 124–128 *4 fs.* 1945) for additional notes on this species.

Polyporus [Mich.] Fr. *per* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: lvi, 341. Jan. 1, 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: πολύς, many; πόρος, pore. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES selected: *Polyporus esculentus* . . . Mich. (*pl. 71 f. 1*) = *Boletus tuberaster* Jacq.—Closely related to, if not conspecific with, *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr.

PROTONYM: *Polyporus* Mich., Nov. Pl. Gen. 129. 1729 (pre-Linnean).—This genus was established for centrally stalked polypores as distinguished from Boleti. Some of Micheli's 14 species are not easily identifiable; the most outstanding one is that classical fungus now known as *Polyporus tuberaster* (Jacq.) per Fr. — "Its nomenclatorial type was *P. leptocephalus* (Jacq.) Fr." according to Murrill (*1903:* 89; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 29. 1904), which means that Micheli's first species has been referred to *Polyporus leptocephalus* afterwards.

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Polyporus* [Mich.] Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 10. 1763.—If no later starting-points had been adopted for fungi, this would have to be taken as the first valid publication of Micheli's name, although Adanson cannot exactly be called a 'Linnean' author. The generic description leaves little doubt about Adanson's conception:

"[*Figure.*] Chapeau hémisph. ou orbicul. [doublé en-dessous de tuyaux verticaux.] Porté sur une tige centrale. [*Substance.*] Coriace ou subér. [*Graines.*] Ovoides couvrant la surface interne des trous."

Moreover, Adanson cited "Mich. *t. 70 f. 4. 6 à 10*". Thus he omitted to mention Micheli's plate 71 figure 1 which represents *Polyporus tuberaster*. This illustration is not cited elsewhere by Adanson and in view of his description it may well be argued that he inadvertently omitted to mention a figure of the most outstanding species of the genus.

The genus was suppressed by Linnaeus (1753) who merged it into *Boletus*. For this reason it became obsolete until it was firmly restored in a widened circumscription by Fries. In the meantime, however, is was not altogether rejected: Adanson (see above), followed by von Haller, Scopoli (Intr. Hist. nat. 361. 1777, "Hall."), and Paulet may be mentioned.

Paulet (Mycétol. 27 ["*polyporus* (Micheli)"], 47. Circa 1812; Icon. Champ. *pls. 13, 29, 30, 164, 165.* 1812–35[51]) accepted *Polyporus* Mich. and used it on plates as the generic appellation in binomial combinations for seven species: *P. ulmi* Paul., *P. frondosus* (Dicks.?) Paul., *P. multiconcha* Paul., *P. umbilicatus* Paul., *P. carbonarius* Paul., *P. fascietus* Paul., and *P. tuberaster* Paul. These show that he kept closely to Micheli's genus as originally introduced, but with the present Code it will hardly do to agree with Murrill who stated that "it was . . . . left to Paulet . . . to securely establish the genus".

Fries's first use of the generic name states that it is "*Polyporus* Mich. restit. Fries" (Obs. mycol. **1**: 121. 1815); follow a generic description, some general remarks (for instance, "Quamvis omnes hujus Generis species notas in Mscr. disposuerim, has hoc loco enumerare superfluum duxi . . ."), and the description of a few species Fries wanted to describe in the framework of his "Observationes". He briefly reviewed the Swedish species in the following year (Fries *in* Liljebl., Utkast svensk Fl., Uppl. 3, 503, 659. 1816).

SCOPE. When *Polyporus* was validly re-published by Fries in 1821, it was applied as the name of all 'polypores' except *Fistulina* Bull. per Fr. and *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. The number of species amounted to about 130.

TYPIFICATION. In fixing the type species for the name as re-published by Fries, two points deserve special consideration. It can be established with certainty, (i) that Fries did take up the name directly from Micheli's work, although it was applied in a wider circumscription, and (ii) that he was perfectly aware which of his species were Micheli's original ones. Thus, he re-introduced in 1815 (see above) the name as "*Polyporus* Mich. restit. Fries"; in the "Systema" one will find "*Polyporus* Mich. p. 129" mentioned under *Polyporus* trib. I *Mesopus* Fr. as a synonym and in his "Hymenomycetes europaei" (1874) at the end of the genus description the remark, "*Mesopodes* = *Polyporus*; reliqui = *Agaricum* Michel." (p. 552), and following the description of tribus *Mesopodes*, "*Polyporus* Mich. p. 129" (p. 523). These and similar arguments lead Donk (*1933:* 124–126) to select as type *Polyporus tuberaster*, a fungus common to both Micheli's and Fries's species. It is a renowned classic species well figured by Micheli. This choice also agrees best with the current restricted emendations of *Polyporus* and has been adopted by Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 58; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Imazeki (*1943:* 61), Bondartsev (*1953:* 44), Lowe (*apud* Overholts, *1953:* 163), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 154).

Two others of Micheli's species might be considered as possible rivals of *P. tuberaster*, viz. (i) *Polyporus subsquamosus* (L.) per Fr. (Fries cited Micheli's *pl. 70 f. 2* and *pl. 70 f. 3* under two of his varieties of this species), and (ii) *P. perennis* (L.) per Fr. (similar remark for Micheli's *pl. 70 f. 8* and *pl. 70 f. 10*). The first of these

---

[51] At first Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 29. 1904) dated Paulet's plate 13, "1793", that is, the date of Paulet's text, "Traité des champignons". Afterwards he corrected this into "1812?" (Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 54. 1907), which is merely a guess. — See also under *Agarico-carnis* for some remarks on Paulet's work.

two fungi is one of the few species kept in the genus when Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 17. 1881) restricted the name *Polyporus* to a small group (corresponding rather with *Scutiger* Murrill, including *Boletopsis* Fayod). The other one, *P. perennis*, was made a leading species of a different genus, *Polystictus* Fr. (1851), q.v., by Fries himself.

Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) suggested *Polyporus brumalis* (Pers.) per Fr. for "*Polyporus* Mich.) Fr. Ep. 427. 1838". It is doubtful whether it is represented among Micheli's species.

W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 78) considered "*Polyporus* Mich. ex Fries . . . 1821" as based on *Boletus squamosus* Huds., why, he does not disclose; it is not even Fries's first species of 1821, which is *Polyporus* (*Favolus*) *tessulatus* Fr. per Fr., based on Micheli's plate 71 figure 2. Perhaps his choice reflects Murrill's type (see below), or he identified *P. tuberaster* with it? This selection is not a fortunate one because Fries placed *P. squamosus* in a special subgenus '*Favolus*' (see also under *Favolus* Fr.). He retained *P. tuberaster* in the typical group, *Polyporus* ('*Microporus*') trib. *Mesopus*.

Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 1. 1948) indicated *Polyporus arcularius* Batsch) per Fr. as type species of *Polyporus* Mich. ex. Fr.

REMARK. The author's citatation of the name here adopted is 'Fr. per Fr.' rather than 'Adans. per Fr.'

METONYMOUS HOMONYM: *Polyporus* "Paulet"; Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. **31**: 29. 1904; **32**: 484. 1905. —Murrill ascribed the first valid publication of the generic name in accordance with the Code he followed to Paulet (see above) and took that author's first species as type: *Polyporus ulmi* Paul. = *P.* "*caudicinus* (Scop.) Murrill" = *P. squamosus*. Compare also Murrill, *1903:* 89, 100, where *P. ulmi* was already indicated as type species of Paulet's name, before the latter name was definitely taken up by him. This introduction of the generic name cannot easily be interpreted as a monadelphous homonym of *Polyporus* Fr., because their ultimate common source, *Polyporus* Mich., is pre-Linnean. van Overeem (*in* Ic. Fung. malay. H. 7: 3. 1924) accepted this genus *Polyporus* "(Micheli) Paulet" with the same type species.

VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Polyphorus*"; Kummer, Führ. Pilzk., 2. Aufl., 110. 1882. — "*Poliporus*"; J. Rick *in* An. prim. Reun. Sul-Amer. Bot. **2**: 271 1938. — HOMONYM: *Polyporus* (Pers.) per S. F. Gray (Nov.? 1821; Polyporaceae), q.v. — TYPONYMS: *Tuberaster* Boccone (1697; pre-Linnean name) and *Coriomyces* Batt. (1755), and compare *Cerioporus* Quél. and *Bresadolia* Speg.

Polyporus (Pers.) *per* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 645. Nov. (?) 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: πολύς, many; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus ramosus* Bull. —An abnormal condition of *Polyporus sulphureus* (Bull.) per Fr. — DEVALIDATED BASINYM: *Boletus* sect. *Polyporus* Pers., Syn. Fung. 549. 1801.—This was introduced for one species, *Boletus ramosus*, the same as Gray's. — REMARKS. There is no indication that Persoon's infrageneric epithet has any relation to *Polyporus* Mich. (see *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.). On the contrary it appears to be introduced as an entirely 'new' one: afterwards Persoon replaced it by '*Cladoporus*',

which is significant. — After Gray, the Persoonian taxon was once more raised to generic rank as *Cladoporus* (Pers.) Chev., q.v. — HOMONYM: *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. (Jan. 1, 1821), q.v. — SYNISONYM: *Cladoporus* (Pers.) Chev. (1826), q.v. — TYPONYM: *Laetiporus* Murrill (1904). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homony m.

Polyporus Adans. and *Polyporus* "Paul.": Murrill 1904.—See under *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr.

Polystichoides. — See *Polystictoides*.

'*P o l y s t i c t a*'. — Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 384. 1821) introduced *Polyporus* subgen. *Polysticta* Fr. for two resupinate species, viz. *Polyporus corticola* Fr. and *P. reticulatus* (Hoffm.) per Fr. ("Nees"). A few years later Persoon (Mycol. europ. **2**: 110. 1825) listed "*Polysticta reticulata*. Fries l.c. p. 385" as a synonym of *Polyporus reticulatus* and appended in a footnote Fries's description of the taxon, starting it with "*Polysticta*, . . .," thus giving the impression that Fries had introduced a genus of that name. — Not to be confused with *Polystictus* Fr. (1851) which is a quite different taxon.

Polystictoides Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid. **14**: 754, 1916; Polip. Fl. Espan. 140. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus *Polystictus*; -ὀειδης, resembling. Gender: f., treated as m. by Lázaro. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus cuticularis* (Bull.) per Fr.— Judging only from his description, Lázaro might well have correctly identified this species. — SCOPE. Introduced with nine species. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was indicated by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96: *1953:* 78) and Imazeki (*1943:* 63). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Polystichoides*"; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 78. 1953. — TYPONYMS. Compare *Inonotus* P. Karst. (1879) and *Phaeoporus* J. Schroet. (1888 .

Polystictus Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 70. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 54). — ETYMOLOGY: πολύστικτος, with many punctures. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr.

SCOPE. Established as a large genus, divided into numerous groups, the first of these being called "Stirps *Polysticti perennis*". At the end *Polystictus* subgen. *Placoderma* (Fr.) Fr. (transferred from *Trametes*) was appended. The genus covered European as well as extra-European species, but the paper in which the name was published was primarily concerned with the latter so that the European species (as well as extra-European ones that were not represented among the collections treated) were generally only indicated by references to their number of sequence in Fries's "Epicrisis", or only mentioned by name as examples, or, as in the case of *P. perennis*, indicated in the names of the stirpes, without being mentioned otherwise.

TYPIFICATION. The most eligible species are the type species of the constituent nine stirpes; some of them may be mentioned: *Polyporus perennis*, *P. sacer* Afz. ex Fr., *P. discipes* Berk., *P. prolificans* Fr., *P. funalis* Fr. (all mentioned because their stirpes were called after them), and *P. versicolor* (L.) per Fr. (selected for *Polystictus* stirps *Coriacea*

Fr., the seventh stirps). Of these Donk (*1933:* 237; *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 142–144. 1949) selected *P. perennis*, first (1933) singled out by the 'residue-method' and afterwards (1942) by selection from the two eligible species previously suggested as types (the other species being *Polyporus versicolor*). Accepted, it would seem, by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 78) and also selected by Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dep. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 77: 6. 1918). In this connection it may be pointed out that Patouillard (Essai taxon. Hym. 100. 1900) already listed *Polystictus* "(Fr.) Karst." as a synonym of *Xanthochrous* sect. *Perennes* "Fr."

Murrill (*1903:* 93, 100; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 341. 1904) regarded as type *Polyporus parculus* Klotzsch; and Singer (*1944:* 66) and Bondartsev (*1953:* 43), *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr. Both Murrill and Singer, *nota bene*, indicated what they thought to be the first species; both species belong to "Stirps *Polysticti perennis*" and in view of the name given to this group by Fries, decidedly less eligible than *Polyporus perennis*.

Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) suggested *Polyporus versicolor*, type species of *Coriolus* Quél. (1886), a well entrenched generic name now.

REMARKS. It would appear that *Polyporus* subgen. *Polysticta* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 384. 1821), introduced for a few resupinate species, has no nomenclatorial connection with *Polystictus* Fr. 1851; see preceding page.

Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 142–145. 1949) proposed *Polystictus* for conservation against the earlier synonyms *Coltricia* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Striglia* S. F. Gray (1821). Rogers (*in* Farlowia **4**: 31–32. 1950) recommended the rejection of this proposal because he believed *Coltricia* S. F. Gray, q.v., much better established for the small group so called to-day than *Polystictus*. This may be the case, but he did not think of 'conservative' mycologists [like Saccardo, Rea] who apply *Polystictus* in a very extensive sense and who would have to take up *Coltricia* for the Friesian genus. In the meantime the proposal has been rejected by the Special Committee for Fungi (*in* Taxon **2**: 32. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45**: 320. 1953).

TYPONYMS: *Coltricia* S. F. Gray (1821); *Pelloporus* Quél. (1886); and *Xanthochrous* Pat. (1897); and compare *Volvopolyporus* Lloyd ex Sacc. & Trott. (1912).

Poria Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 10. 1763 (devalidated name). — Type species: not selected. — Protonym: *Poria* Hill, General Nat. Hist. **2**: 33. 1751 (pre-Linnean).— Introduced for polypores, sessile as well as resupinate species; three species were described and nineteen others mentioned. Not to be confused with *Porium* Hill, q.v. As an example Hill (*pl. 4*) depicted his first species by copying a figure of Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. *pl. 60 fig. at top.* 1729); this species is now called *Fistulina hepatica* (Schaeff.) per Fr. Perhaps the first author to take up the genus was P. Browne (Hist. Jamaica 76–77. 1756), in a non-Linnean work; neither a reference to Hill nor a generic description was supplied and Browne (not 'Brown' as Adanson cited) would not have validly published the name, even if no later starting-points had been introduced. — Adanson cited the genus as "*Poria*. Brown / *Agaricum* Mich. t. 61. Ordo 3. f. 2." and added the description: "Chapeau demiorbicul. doublé en-dessous de tuyaux verticaux. Porté sur une tige latérale . . .." — The type should

be either one of Browne's species to whom Adanons ascribed the name *Poria*; or Micheli's fungus cited by its illustration, and which became the basis of *Polyporus michelii* Fr., a species closely related to *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. — The first author to associate "*Poria* Adans." with binomials was Scopoli (Diss. Sci. nat.; Pl. subterr. 103–105. 1772). I am not aware of a later use of the name. — Homonym: *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray (1821; 'Polyporaceae').

Poria Pers. *per* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 639. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Boletus medulla-panis* Jacq. sensu Pers. — *Poria medullaris* S. F. Gray, a name change for P e r s o o n's fungus.—It is not precisely known what the original *Boletus medulla-panis* Jacq. represents but Persoon's interpretation of this species can be readily verified by a study of his specimens preserved at Leiden; they are the basis of Bresadola's interpretation of Persoon's fungus and belong to the same species as *Polyporus unitus* Pers. (cf. Donk, *1933*: 234).

Several complications that might arise would be avoided if it could be agreed that, first, Persoon correctly interpreted *Boletus medulla-panis* Jacq. (Misc. austr. **1**: 141 *pl. 11.* 1778[52]), and, secondly, Fries's revalidation of the name as *Polyporus medulla-panis* (Jacq.) per Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 380. 1821) may well be typified by Jacquin's original specimen represented by his plate. The current tendency is (i) to consider Jacquin's account insufficient for recognition and for interpretation in Persoon's sense, and, eventually, to drop it as a nomen dubium; and (ii) to believe that Fries in 1821 described a different fungus from both Jacquin's and Persoon's. Ad (i). Recently I carefully compared ample material of *Poria medulla-panis* as understood by Persoon with Jacquin's description and plate and had to conclude that Persoon might well have had the same fungus. In any case his interpretation is no less well founded than many other cases of species of the early authors and currently accepted. Ad (ii). Fries's phrase description is so worded that it does not positively exclude either Jacquin's or Persoon's fungus, if these are different. He adds, "Quot auctores hanc speciem memoraverunt, tot fere diversae species. . . . Noster . . .," and gives some details of it. He cites Jacquin and evidently includes the type of *Boletus medulla-panis* in his concept as a matter of course. Why should we exclude it?

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Poria* Pers. *in* Neues Mag. Bot. **1**: 109. 1794 (= Tent. 29. 1797).—No author was indicated. The three species included are "*P*[*oria*] *medulla-panis* Jacq. (sub *Boleto*)"; *P. salicina* (Pers. apud Gmel.) Pers. = *Phellinus ferruginosus* (Schrad. apud Gmel. per Fr.) Pat.[53]; and *P. fimbriata* Pers. = *Porotheleum fimbriatum*

[52] Type, represented by the plate. If one were to conclude that Jacquin's fungus was based on the type of a synonym cited from von Haller, or on *Agaricum album, terrestre, medullam panis referens* Mich. (Nov. Pl. Gen. 121 *pl. 63 f. 2.* 1729), also cited as a synonym, then *Boletus medulla-panis* would become a nomen dubium. Nobody has as yet suggested an acceptable identity for Micheli's fungus and its selection would seem less well founded than the choice of Jacquin's own specimen figured.

[53] More in particular a form that seems to answer to *Phellinus ferruginosus* subsp. *umbrinus* (Fr.) Bourd. & G. (Hym. France 627. 1928); compare Donk (*1933*: 256), who substituted

(Pers. per Fr.) Fr. = *Stromatoscypha fimbriata* (Pers. per Fr.) Donk ('Cyphellaceae'). Afterwards Persoon reduced his genus to the rank of a section: *Boletus* sect. *Poria* (Pers.) Pers., Syn. Fung. 542. 1801; it was this group that was raised to generic rank again by Gray. Exactly the same had been previously done by Roussel (Fl. Calvad., 2e Ed., 72. 1806), who called the genus "*Poria*, n[obis]: *Boletus Poria* P." — See also *Poria* Adans.

SCOPE. When Gray validly re-published *Poria* Pers. he listed (as indiginous to the British Isles): (i) *Poria vulgaris* S. F. Gray (*Boletus favus* L. sensu Bull.[54]; not *Polyporus vulgaris* Fr., which is difficult to interpret), (ii) *Boletus cryptarum* Bull., (iii) *Poria destruens* S. F. Gray = *B. destructor* Schrad., (iv) *B. spongiosus* "Bolt." ("not of Lightfoot"), and (v) *Poria medullaris*. The order of the species common to both authors is the same as Persoon's of 1801. Evidently Gray raised Persoon's section unaltered to generic rank!

TYPIFICATION. Persoon himself regarded his first species, *Poria medulla-panis*, as the most typical. This appears from his herbarium which contains several specimens of it and from a later remark (Persoon, Traité Champ. comest. 90. 1818): "Parmi les Bolets crustacés (*Poria*), l'espèce assez vulgaire est le *Boletus medulla panis*, Jacquin . . .." After having dealt with this fungus he proceeded to mention only briefly *Boletus contiguus* Pers. and *B. salicinus*. Murrill (*1903:* 89, 100; *in* Mycologia **12**: 48. 1920) and W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 90; *1953:* 78) already regarded *Poria medulla-panis* (Jacq.) Pers. as type species of "*Poria* Pers." (1794). Since Gray adhered entirely to *Boletus* sect. *Poria* of Persoon (1801), which in turn is nothing but the expanded genus *Poria* of the same author (1794), the logical type species of the generic name as validly re-published by Gray must coincide with the type species of *Poria* Pers. *Poria medullaris* ('sensu Pers.'), therefore, was selected by Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 105. 1949) and accepted by Kotlaba & Pouzar (*in* Česká Mykol. **13**: 32. 1959). The same species had been selected before by the Nomenclatural Comittee of the British Mycological Society (*in* Trans. Brit. mycol. Soc. **23**: 227. 1939) for "*Poria* (Pers.) Karst. emend. Cooke".

Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) suggested *Poria vaporaria* Pers. as type species of '*Poria* Pers. 1801'. This species has been variously interpreted. The reason for this choice seems to be Fries's remark (Hym. europ. 579. 1874) under *Polyporus vaporarius* (Pers.) per Fr.: ". . . vulgatissimus generis et P. resupinatorum typus", which Saccardo (Syll. Fung. **6**: 311. 1888), who in contrast to Fries accepted a genus *Poria*, rendered as, "Vulgatissima generis et *Poriae* typus."

W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 87; *1953:* 79) and Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dep. sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 72: 6. 1947) considered "*Poria* Pers. ex S. F. Gray" and "*Poria* (Persoon) S. F. Gray" as based on "*Polyporus vulgaris* Fr." No species of this name was included either by Persoon or Gray, either as a recognized

---

Persoon's name by *Ochroporus confusus* Donk, an untenable name. It is not *Polyporus salicinus* (Pers.) per Fr. sensu Fr. (1838), which is now held to be *Phellinus conchatus* (Pers. per Fr.) Quél.

[54] See for this species p. 210.

species or as a synonym; thus, this appointment seems void. Perhaps, the authors intended "*Poria vulgaris* S. F. Gray" which is a widely different fungus; in that case we are dealing with an unhappy application of the first-species rule.

MONADELPHOUS HOMONYMS: (i) *Poria* Pers. *per* P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3** No. 9: 19. Jan. 1, 1881; *in* Medd. Fauna Fl. fenn. **6**: 10. 1881; *in* Bidr. Kann. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: 81. 1882.[55]—Karsten ascribed the name to "(Pers.)"[56] and listed as its (Finnish) species: "*P. ferruginosa* (Schrad.) . . . *P. contigua* (Pers.) . . . *P. rixosa* (Karst.) . . . *P. obliqua* (Pers.) . . .." The genus was intended to cover the brown, resupinate polypores. Because Karsten's first species [*Polyporus ferruginosus* (Schrad. per Fr.] is the only one also represented among Persoon's (as *Poria salicina*), Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 174–175. 1941) selected it as type.[57]

(ii) *Poria* Pers. *per* Cooke *in* Grevillea **14**: 109. 1886.—Although Cooke called the genus "*Poria*. Pers. Syn. p. 542." he was undoubtly inspired by *Polyporus* series tertia *Poria* of Fries [*in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III 1: 70. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 54) = *Polyporus* trib. *Resupinatus* (C. Nees) *per* Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 377. 1821; Epicr. 481. 1838] as may be deduced from the introduction to Cooke's paper (*in* Grevillea **13**: 80. 1885).[58] Cooke did not indicate that he was aware of Karsten's previous use of the name and it seems logical in this case to accept an additional monadelphous homonym, which cannot be called *Poria* (Pers.) Karst. emend. Cooke as was done by the British Committe, or *Poria* Pers. per Karst. emend. Cooke. The Committee (l.c.), moreover, thought it preferable to select for it as type species "*P. medulla-panis* Pers.", thus, the same species as has been chosen for *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray.

"*Poria* (Fr.) Karst. emend. Sacc." of Maire (*in* Int. Rules bot. Nomencl., 3. Ausg., 123. 1935) should rather be identified with *Poria* Pers. per Cooke; as type species, *Polyporus vulgaris* Fr. was given. This is a diversely interpreted fungus: compare Eriksson (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **43**: 1–5. 1949). — Bondartsev (*1953:* 36) gives "*P. vulgaris* (Fr.) Cke. sensu Rom." for "*Poria* (Fr.) Karst." The species he thus

---

[55] It has been assumed that Karsten re-published *Poria* in the first publication cited where the name appears in a key. W. B. Cooke stated that there was no description to distinguish it from its neighbours, which is incorrect; the description runs: "Contextus coloratus. / Contextus ferrugineus, cinnamomeus vel fuscescens / Pileus fere nullus. Resupinati." A second use of the name by Karsten in the same year (second publication cited) is generally overlooked: in this case the description runs, "Pileus resupinatus. Pori ferruginei vel nigricantes." In the third publication, of the next year, there is an accompanying description, too.

[56] In the three cited publications Karsten gave as the author's citation "(Pers.)", "(Fr.) Karst.", and "(Hill.) Karst." respectively. I doubt whether he knew for which group Hill coined the name. See also under *Poria* Adans.

[57] *In* Medd. **6**: 10. 1881, and in 1882, the first species is "*P*[*oria*] *obliqua*".

[58] *Polyporus* trib. *Resupinatus* is nothing else but a synisonym of *Boletus* sect. *Poria* (Pers.) Pers. ≡ *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray; both names are based on *Poria* Pers. When Fries published the tribus name he cited (besides "*Poria*. Hill. Pers. disp. p. 29") "*Resup.* Nees Syst. p. 222", that is, *Boletus* sect. *Resupinatus* C. Nees (Syst. Pilze 222. 1816 & Ueberbl. 57. 1817). Nees in his turn cited "*Poria*. Pers."; he kept Persoon's taxon of 1801 (Syn. Fung. 542, as *Boletus* sect. *Poria*) unaltered. Another synisonym is, in my opinion, *Physisporus* Chev., q.v.

indicates is *Poria vulgaris* (Fr.) Cooke sensu Romell *in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **20**: 21. 1926 (not of earlier publications) = *Poria subincarnata* (Peck) Murrill as described by Eriksson (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **43**: 7 *f.* 2, *pl.* 1. 1949).

Compare also Secretan (Mycogr. suisse **3**: 174. 1833).[59]

REMARKS. Before S. F. Gray's "Arrangement" could be accepted as post-Friesian and, therefore, before the generic name *Poria* could be regarded as validly republished in that work, it was of some importance to fix the earliest re-establishment of the Persoonian name. This situation brought the two monadelphous homonyms '*Poria* P. Karst.' and '*Poria* Cooke' into prominence and some proposals for conservation were felt to be desirable. Thus Maire (l.c.) proposed "*Poria* (Fr.) Karst. emend. Sacc." (= *Poria* Pers. per Cooke) for conservation against '*Physisporus* Gill. (1874–77)' (= *Physisporus* Chev. 1826). The British Committee (l.c.), too, recommended the conservation of "*Poria* (Pers.) Karst. emend. Cooke" (= *Poria* Pers. per Cooke) against *Physisporus* Chev., and Donk (l.c., 1941) followed with a proposal for conservation of *Poria* Pers. per Cooke against both *Physisporus* Chev. and *Poria* Pers. per P. Karst., as well as a second proposal for the conservation of *Phellinus* Quél. 1886 against *Poria* Pers. per P. Karst. When Gray's "Arrangement" definitely acquired its status as 'post-Friesian', all these suggestions had to be rejected and Donk (l.c., 1949) withdrew his proposals.

I recommend that *Poria* be treated as if the name were not associated with a generally acceptable type species, which after all may well be the actual situation. This would facilitate the use of the name for the big artificial genus to which it is now applied. That genus will gradually shrink by transfer of species to more natural genera, but no doubt a residue will be left for a long time to come.

Poria medulla-panis sensu Pers. (i) very rarely may form fruit-bodies that are not completely resupinate; (ii) the tube-layer may become stratified (hence the transfer to *Fomes* by Lowe); and (iii) the spores are sufficiently characteristic to distinguish it readily from the rest of *Poria*. From a taxonomic point of view it is a poor '*Poria*'. If one wants to maintain the name *Poria* for an artificial genus of resupinate polypores and at the same time wants to exclude the *Poria medulla-panis* complex the name *Perenniporia* Murrill is available for the latter.

When I came to the conclusion that *Boletus medulla-panis* Jacq. sensu Pers. had to be regarded as type (see above under "Typification"), I carefully avoided the consequences, that is, restricting the name to the type species and, perhaps, some related extra-european species, which I had previously transferred to the Ganodermataceae (cf. Donk, *1933:* 230, 234).[60] Quite recently Kotlaba & Pouzar (*in*

[59] For a discussion, see Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 174 footnote 21. 1941). — Secretan stated that "Ce genre [Bolets = *Boletus*] admet trois subdivisions . . .", and his "Troisième section" he called "Pories. *Poriae* (*Polysticta* Fries)". Thus he did not definitely apply *Poria* as a generic name.

[60] Similar conclusions had already been advanced by Romell and Coker. These authors are criticized by Overholts (*1953:* 45), who in addition remarks that "it is difficult to decide why these authors omit *Fomes fraxinophilus*, *F. juniperinus*, and *F. Ellisianus*".

Česká Mykol. **13**: 32, 36. 1959) rectified this omission and have emended *Poria* Pers. per S. F. Gray to cover its type (which they call *Poria medullaris* S. F. Gray) and the two species for which *Truncospora* Pilát (q.v.) was instituted, however, without explaining what is going to happen to the one hundred and more species which are currently placed in the artificial genus *Poria*. I hope that it will be tacitly agreed not to follow this course, and that the recommendation made in the preceding remark will be adopted.

HOMONYM: *Poria* Adans. (1763; devalidated name). — TYPONYM (isonym): *Physisporus* Chev. (1826).

Porium Hill, General nat. Hist. **2**: 40. 1751 (pre-Linnean name). — Besides a genus *Poria* (for which see under *Poria* Adans.), Hill recognized a genus *Porium* which he placed in his Fungi, "Class the second. Such as grow erect, and consist of pedicles crowned with heads." In the main the genus is the same as *Polyporus* Mich. Three species were described and eight others mentioned by their English names. — "*Porium* Adans. Fam. **2**: 28. 1763", as cited by W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 79) seems to be an error for the present name?

Poroauricula "McGinty"; Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **5**: 708. 1917 (not validly published); see also Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 141. 1936. — Coined in connection with *Laschia intestinalis* (Berk.) Lloyd (*Favolus intestinalis* Berk.). This species does not seem to have been redescribed by a modern author. Lowy (*in* Mycologia **44**: 685. 1952) thinks that "the photo published by Lloyd [op. cit. *f. 1058*] is suggestive of *A*[*uricularia*] *delicata*", which is about Lloyd's conclusion. Mr. D. A. Reid kindly informed me that the type has clavate basidia with four apical sterignata and that it represents a species of *Favolaschia* (Pat.) Pat.— For some general remarks on the 'McGinty' names, which are not validly published, see Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 205. 1951).

Porodaedalea Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 367. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; the genus *Daedalea*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus pini* (Thore) per Pers. (inclusive of *Boletus pini* Brot.).

Porodisculus Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 47. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Porodiscus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species, also of basinym): *Peziza pendula* "Schw." [sensu Murrill].—For this species, see under *Porodiscus*. — BASINYM: *Porodiscus* Murrill (1903), q.v. — REMARK. A name change for *Porodiscus* Murrill, which is preoccupied. — Maire (*in* Int. Rules bot. Nom., 3. Ausg., 123. 1935) proposed the conservation of *Porodisculus* against *Enslinia* Fr., q.v. Since the latter name was impriorable on account of its earlier homonym, the proposal was superfluous (cf. Donk *in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **17**: 195. 1941; Rogers *in* Farlowia **1**: 471. 1949; and the Special Committee for Fungi *in* Taxon **2**: 29. 1953; *in* Mycologia **45**: 314. 1953).

Porodiscus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **30**: 432. 1903; **32**: 482. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; δίσκος, quoit. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Peziza pendula* "Schw." = *Cyphella pendula* (Schwaegr.) ex Fr. = *Polyporus pendulus* (Schwaegr. ex Fr.) J. B. Ellis.—As interpreted by Murrill this is the same as *Polyporus pocula* (Torrey ex Fr.) Berk. & C.[61] — REMARK. Though indicated as a new genus, this was practically a name change for *Enslinia* Fr., q.v., which was preoccupied. — VARIANT SPELLING. "*Parodiscus porodisculus* Murrill" was cited as a synonym of *Polyporus* "*Lepricurii*" (= *leprieurii*) Mont. by J. Rick *in* An. prim. Reun. Sul-Amer. Bot. **2**: 282. 1938. — HOMONYMS: *Porodiscus* Grev. (1863; Discaceae, Bacillariophyceae) and *Porodiscus* Lloyd (1919; Pyrenomycetes). — TYPONYM: *Enslinia* Fr. (1849; preoccupied). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, changed into *Porodisculus* Murrill.

Porogramme Pat. Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 63. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; γραμμή, line, written character. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Poria dussii* Pat. — BASINYM: *Poria* subgen. *Porogramme* Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **15**: 199. 1899.—"*P. Dussii*, ainsi que les espèces suivantes et quelques autres, constituent les types d'un groupe qui est bien distinct." — SCOPE. The genus (1900) was divided into three groups, of which the second is the largest with six species mentioned by name, the first and the third consisting of one species each. Of each group one species was mentioned in the preceding discussion; they are *Porogramme grisea* (Berk. & C.) Pat., *P. dussii* (Pat.) Pat., and *P. lateritia* (Pat.) Pat. — TYPIFICATION. From the remarks accompanying the generic description (1900) it follows that three species, each corresponding to a group, may be taken as eligible. The choice from these is *Poria dussii*, of the largest group, already emphasized by Patouillard and indicated by W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 79) for the basinym. W. B. Cooke (l.c.) simultaneously listed a different species for the generic name as the result of the first-species rule, viz. "*P*[*orogramme*] *grisea* (Berk. & Curt., [Pat.]," which may mean either *Kneiffia grisea* Berk. & C. or *Grammothele grisea* Berk. & C. the two being taken as synonyms by Patouillard.

Porolaschia Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 138. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; the genus *Laschia*. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Laschia sprucei* Berk.

'BASINYM': *Laschia* sect. *Porolaschia* Pat. *in* J. Bot. (ed. Morot), Paris **1**: 231. 1887.—"Esp. principales: *L. clypeata* Pat., *L. pyxidaeformis* Bk., *L. guaranitica* Spg., *L. papulata* Mtg., etc." — Of these species the first is the one most extensively described; it is accompanied by figures (of fruit-bodies as well as microscopical

---

[61] The basinym of the latter name was published in the starting-point book: Fries (Elench. **2**: 60. 1828) called it "*S*[*phaeria*] *Pocula* . . . — Torrey! . . . (Communicavit Schweiniz! v. s.)." The basinym is usually ascribed to von Schweinitz (1832).

details). Moreover, Patouillard remarks on it: "Autour du *L. clypeata* viennent se grouper quelques espèces, parmi lesquelles nous indiquerons les plus remarquables. . .." Follow *L. pezizoides* and a number of other species casually mentioned. Then, there is Patouillard's own remark (p. 226): "Toutes les espèces de ce genre [*Laschia*] peuvent se grouper autour de quatre types que nous allons examiner successivement. Ce sont: . . . *L. clypeata* Pat. [pour 'Section III. — *Porolaschia*' Pat., p. 231]." There can be no doubt that *L. clypeata* must be considered type of *Laschia* sect. *Porolaschia*. It will presently be demonstrated that Patouillard's genus *Porolaschia* (1900) is entirely different.

VALID PUBLICATION. Murrill (*1903:* 97, 101) ascribed the genus to Patouillard *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **14**: 55. 1898 and stated that it was based on "*P. micropora* Pat., a single species". What actually happened is this: In the cited publication, Patouillard described a new species under the name of *Porolaschia micropora* Pat. and remarked in an observation to it, "Nous plaçons cette espèce dans le genre *Porolaschia* à cause de sa consistance uniformément gelatineuse, mais elle a des relations étroites avec *Gloeoporus* par son hymenium et par la disposition générale des hyphes." From this remark it follows that (i) Patouillard acted as if the genus had already been validly published (which is not known to be the case), that (ii) he presumably did not regard *P. micropora* as typical for that (unpublished) genus (cf. the reference to *Gloeoporus* Mont.), and that (iii) he did not supply anything that could be evaluated as a generic description, the information given being exclusively related to the species and not to the generic name (although it might be tacitly inferred from it that Patouillard ascribed to *Porolaschia* a "consistance uniformément gélatineuse"). As it is quite clear that Patouillard did not intend at that moment to establish a new genus and certainly not one exclusively based on *P. micropora*, and as he neither furnished a generic description nor a reference to a valid description (not even an author's citation after the generic name), I would conclude that he did not validly publish the generic name on this occasion. This leaves *Porolaschia* published as a generic name by Patouillard in 1900.

SCOPE. Patouillard (1900) called his genus "*Porolaschia* Pat. ap. Morot, Journ. Bot. [1887], p. 231 (pr. p.)". However, it has nothing in common with *Laschia* sect. *Porolaschia*, as he was well aware himself: "Les espèces considerées primitivement comme *Porolaschia*, mais dont les affinités vont aux *Polyporus*, ont été réunies à *Leucoporus* (*Gelatinosi*) ou constituent le genre *Hologloea*." The original species of the genus are: "Ex.: *P. Sprucei* (Berk.), *P. tonkinensis* Pat., *P. nummularia* Berk., *P. manipularis* Berk., etc." None of them is the same as any of the section! The indication "pr. p." in the reference to the sectional name evidently should be read as, 'with the exclusion of the original species'!

TYPIFICATION. The selection of the type species should be made from the species mentioned when the genus was established and without taking into consideration the components of *Laschia* sect. *Porolaschia*. The first species, *Laschia sprucei*, was recently indicated by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 79).

Poronidulus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 425. 1904; **32**: 480. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; nidulus, small nest. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus conchifer* Schw. = *Polyporus conchifer* (Schw.) Steud.: Fr.—For a recent description, see Overholts (*1953*: 350).

Poroptyche Beck *in* Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien **38** (Abhand.): 657. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: πόρος, pore; πτυχή, valley, fold. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species : *Poroptyche candida* Beck.—Judging from the description this might perhaps be identical with the house-fungus often called "*Polyporus destructor* Schrad."

Porostereum Pilát.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 112. 1957).

Porotheleum (Fr. per Fr.) Fr.—'Cyphellaceae' (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 217. 1951).

Porothelium.—See *Porotheleum*.

Postia Fr., Hym. europ. 586. 1874. — ETYMOLOGY: H. von Post. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES selected : *Polyporus lacteus* Fr.—For this species, compare Lundell (*in* Lund. & Nannf., Fungi exs. suec. Fasc. 27–28: 7 No. 1315. 1946).

VALID PUBLICATION. The genus is commonly ascribed to Karsten, but it was first published by Fries (op. cit.).

Page 522 (in a note appended to the description of *Polyporus*): ". . . In Nov. Symb. l.c. exponuntur differentiae *Polypororum*, *Polystictorum* et *Trametum*. His addendum novum genus *Postia*, de quo sub *Daedalea* disseremus. . . ."

Page 586: "Longius distant plures *Polypori* poris sinuosis, labyrinthiformibus intricatisque v. c. n. 74–76, 84, 88, 110 etc., qui a genuinis *Polyporis* differunt, ut *Daedaleae* a *Trametibus*. Facile a *Daedaleis* dignoscuntur carne primo molli succosa, poris tenuibus angustis, dissepimentis tenellis, trama discolore nulla. Hos ut peculiare genus sub *Postiae* nomine distinguere constantius est."

Fries did not actually apply the name in his "Hymenomycetes Europaei", but one can deduce without ambiguity from the quotations that *Postia* was definitely accepted by him, and not merely introduced as a nomen provisiorium. Consequently *Postia* has been, as far as I can judge, validly published by Fries in accordance with the present Code. — If for some reason this view would seem not to be acceptable, the genus should be ascribed to Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 17. 1881): although it was not (except negatively) differentiated from *Tyromyces* in that author's key of 1881 to the Finnish genera of Polyporaceae, he called the genus "*Postia* Fr.", which indicated that he took the name as already published by Fries, the author's citation "Fr." being a valid reference to the earlier Friesian description.[62]

---

[62] A few years earlier Karsten (*in* Medd. Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **5**: 40. 1879) had this entry in his "Symbolae": "*Postia borealis* (Fr.) Karst. primum in regione Mustialensi m. Septembri h.a. observata." — He abandoned the genus in his publications after 1881!

"Contextus albus, subinde in luteum rarissime in roseum vel alutaceum plus minus vergens. Sporae (omnium?) albae. / Pileus carnosus. / Pileus sessilis.

"III. *Tyromyces* n. gen. Pileus caseosus vel carnosus, cute nulla textus. Pori rotundati, integri.

"1. *T. chioneus* (Fr.) . . .. — 2. *T. pallescens* (Fr.) . . ..

"IV. *Postia* Fr.

"1. *P. borealis* (Fr.) . . .. — 2. *P. Weinmanni* (Fr.) . . .. — 3. *P. lactea* (Fr.). — 4. *P. mollis* (Pers.) . . .. — 5. *P. caesia* (Schrad.) . . .. — 6. *P. trabea* (Fr.) . . .."—Karsten (*in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 17. 1881).

SCOPE. The species indicated by Fries (see first quotation above) by their numbers are: no. 74, *Polyporus imberbis* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr.; no. 75, *P. heteroclitus* (Bolt.) per Fr.; no. 76, *P. salignus* Fr.; no. 84, *P. lacteus* Fr.; no. 88, *P. trabeus* Rostk. sensu Fr.; no. 110, *P. weinmanni* Fr.; "etc."

TYPIFICATION. It would seem unwarranted to select *Polyporus borealis* Fr. as type species of Fries's genus. Murrill (*1903:* 94, 101; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 474. 1905) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 80), who ascribed the genus to Karsten (1881), indicated it as type because it was the latter author's first species. It is not among Fries's examples, though if that author had cared to mention more examples it would presumably have been included (no. 112), I believe. Selecting a species originally 'not definitely included' in a n e w taxon by its author, who would certainly have listed it if it really stood foremost in his mind, goes too far. Therefore, I prefer to choose one of the species common to those especially mentioned by Fries and those listed by Karsten (1881) for his restricted emendation (*P. lacteus*, *P. trabeus*, and *P. weinmanni*). All have been subject to controversial interpretations, but, perhaps, *P. lacteus* is the one least doubtful.

HOMONYM: *Postia* Boiss. & Blanch. (1875; Compositae). — STATUS. Priorable. As long as the name was ascribed to Karsten (1881) it had to be considered imprriorable, but when accepting Fries as the author, *Postia* Boiss. & Blanch. becomes the later homonym.

Postia appears to be the correct name for a genus that is now called *Tyromyces* P. Karst. (1881) or *Leptoporus* Quél. (1886). Of the latter two, *Tyromyces* is the 'more correct' name and the one most often used (outside France) and of which the most complete set of combinations is available. Its replacement by *Postia* would merely augment the already existing confusion among the nomenclature of the polypores and would necessitate introducing another name for the genus of phanerogams now so called. Therefore, there is much in favour that the fungus-name *Postia* Fr. be rejected in favour of *Tyromyces* P. Karst. at least until the taxonomy of that genus has been improved. — TYPONYM. Compare *Hemidiscia* Lázaro (1916).

Protodaedalea Imazeki *in* Rev. Mycol. **20**: 159. 1955. — ETYMOLOGY: πρῶτος, first; the genus *Daedalea*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Protodaedalea hispida* Imazeki. — REMARK. The basidia were likened to those of *Tulasnella* J. Schroet., but the descriptive information furnished seems not to uphold such a comparison.

Pseudofavolus Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 80. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: ψευδής, false; the genus *Favolus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Hexagona miquelii* (Mont.) Mont. — SCOPE. "Espèces principales: *P. Miquelii* (Mtg.), *P. pustulatus* (Jungh.), *P. cucullatus* (Mtg.), etc." — TYPIFICATION. It is difficult to make a choice from the three eligible species, which are all represented in Patouillard's herbarium at the Farlow Herbarium. The first species, *Hexagona miquelii*, already selected by Cooke (*1940:* 88; *1953:* 82) and Imazeki (*1942:* 64), will do as well as one of the others, as far as I see it.

Pseudofomes Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 582. 1916; Polipor. Fl. Españ. 84. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: ψευδής false; the genus *Fomes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES selected: "*Pseudofomes nigricans* (Bull.) Láz."—Lázaro cited as synonyms "*Polyporus nigricans* Fr." and "*Polyporus igniarius* Bull. non L." — Under the name *Polyporus nigricans* Fr. different fungi have been confused: it depends on what species Lázaro had in mind whether the generic name *Pseudofomes* has to be listed as a synonym of *Fomes* Fr. Fr. or of *Phellinus* Quél. To Bresadola (Iconogr. mycol. **20**: *pl. 998.* 1931) typical *P. nigricans* is a species with setae, but still different from another *Phellinus* element that has been referred to *Polyporus nigricans* and which he called *Fomes trivialis* Bres. (op. cit. *pl. 955*). The *Fomes* element is close to *P. fomentarius* (L.) per Fr., if not conspecific. As to Lázaro's description, I would say that to him *P. nigricans* was *Fomes trivialis* [*Phellinus igniarius* subsp. *nigricans* (Fr.) Bourd. & G. sensu Bourd. & G., Hym. France 618 *f. 172.* 1928]. — SCOPE. Introduced with four species. — TYPIFICATION. W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 96) considered the genus as "based on *Polyporus nigricans* (Bull.) Fr., a member of the genus *Phellinus*." He confirmed this indication later (W. B. Cooke, *1953:* 82). — Typonyms. If *Polyporus nigricans* as described by Lázaro is considered conspecific with *Polyporus igniarius* (L.) per Fr., then the following names might be accepted as typonyms: *Mison* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Boletus* S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied), and *Scindalma* [Hill] O.K. (1898).

Pseudopelloporus Lázaro.—See under *Heteroporus*.

Pseudotrametes Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 68. 1944; *ex* Bondarts., Trutov. Griby 46, 521. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ψευδής, false; the genus *Trametes*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Trametes gibbosa* (Pers. per Fr.) Fr. — PROTONYM: *Pseudotrametes* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 60. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. Introduced for one species.

Pycnoporellus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 489. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Pycnoporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus fibrillosus* P. Karst.

Pycnoporus P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 18. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: πυκνός, dense, close; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Trametes cinnabarina* (Jacq. per Fr.) Fr. — REMARK. In the same year of the introduction of the genus, Karsten [*in* Acta Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **2** (1): 30. 1881] made *Pycnoporus* a section of *Trametes* Fr., at the same time enlarging the taxon by including for instance *Trametes serialis* (Fr.) Fr. The next year (Karsten *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: 51. 1882) it had completely disappeared (the type being left in *Trametes*), but several years later it reappeared as a genus, including both *Trametes cinnabarina* and *T. serialis*, as well as some other species (Karsten *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 307. 1889). Finally Karsten (Finl. Basidsv. 129, 133. 1899) split up the genus into two parts, retaining *T. serialis* in *Pycnoporus* and referring *T. cinnabarina* to *Hapalopilus* P. Karst. This is an evident misapplication of the name *Pycnoporus* which was monotypic and based on *T. cinnabarina* when validly introduced; *T. serialis* was on that occasion included in *Fomitopsis* by Karsten! — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Picnoporus*"; *in* Rev. mycol. **4**: 130. 1882. — TYPONYM: *Xylometron* Paul. (circa 1812; devalidated name).

Pyreium Paul.—See under *Agarico-carnis*.

Pyropolyporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **30**: 109 Feb. 1903; **32**: 369. 1905; *in* J. Mycol. **9**: 95, 101. May 1903. — ETYMOLOGY: πῦρ fire; the genus *Polyporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Polyporus rubriporus* Quél. = *Polyporus torulosus* (Pers.) per Pers. — BASINYM: *Phellinus* Quél., q.v. — REMARK. There is no escape from the conclusion that *Pyropolyporus* Murrill is nothing but a name change (isonym) for *Phellinus* Quél.: Murrill reproduced Quélet's generic description, listed the original species,[63] and continued to state that, "The name *Phellinus*, however, is preoccupied by *Phelline* assigned in 1826 to a genus of the Ebenaceae. The new name *Pyropolyporus* [is] here proposed . . .." He did not add a description of his own. When introducing the name *Pyropolyporus* he forgot to state which species he took to be the type, but this omission was redressed shortly afterwards in the same year (*in* J. Mycol., l.c.) when he indicated *Polyporus igniarius* (L.) per Fr. The reason why this s e l e c t i o n (first species) cannot be maintained is explained under *Phellinus*.

P y r r h o d e r m a Imazeki; S. Ito, Mycol. Fl. Japan **2** (**4**): 388. 1955 (n.v.). — According to the author (*in litt.*, Dec. 1959), not yet formally published (no Latin description). Based on two species *Polyporus sendaiensis* Yasuda and *Fomes musashiensis* P. Henn. The author considers the second species as doubtfully pertaining to the genus because it has not yet been ascertained whether the spores answer to those indicated in the generic description. Evidently *P. sendaiensis* must be regarded as type. — The name reappears in Imazeki & Hongo (Col. Ill. Fungi Japan 118. 1957).

---

[63] He inadvertently omitted to mention the second of Quélet's species, viz. *Polyporus rubriporus*.

Reisneria Velen., České Houby 738. 1922 (for Latin translation of Czech description, see Pilát, Velen. Sp. nov. Bas. 271. 1948). — ETYMOLOGY: O.Reisner. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Reisneria papyracea* Velen.—This is *Lenzites abietinus* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr., according to Pilát (*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 335. 1940).

Retiporus Endl., Gen. Pl. 39. 1836 ("Batsch"; as a synonym). — Perhaps due to an error Endlicher listed *Boletus* subordo IV *Reteporei* Batsch (Elench. 107. 1783) as "*Retiporus* Batsch." (For a similar case, see *Milleporus*.) — Batsch introduced the '*Reteporei*' for the sessile polypores, with small pores. — Batsch's name was taken up by Duby (Bot. gall. **2**: 787. 1830) and Matthieu (Fl. gén. Belg. **2**: 33. 1854) as *Polyporus* subsect. *Retiporus* Duby and as *Polyporus* sect. *Retiporus* (Duby) Matth. ascribed to Batsch , as a substistute for *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* Fr. — Clements [*in* Univ. Stud. Nebraska **3** (1): 72. 1902] objected to the name for linguistic reasons: "*Retiporus* = *Dictyoporus* (δίκτυον, τό, net, πόρος, ὁ, pore)"—nothing else, not even a reference in the form of an author's citation: not validly published.

Rigidoporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 478. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: rigidus, stiff; πόρος pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus micromegas* Mont. sensu Murrill — *Polyporus sarinamensis* Miq. sensu Murrill (cf. Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 46. 1907). According to Overholts (*1953:* 310) the latter interpretation is conspecific with what he calls *Polyporus zonalis* Berk.

Roduaya H. & P. Syd.—Boletaceae (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 299. 1955).

Romellia Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 338. 1904. — ETYMOLOGY: L. Romell. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Boletus sistotremoides* A. & S. = *Polyporus schweinitzii* Fr. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Rommellia*"; W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 86. 1953 (incidental mention). — HOMONYM: *Romellia* Berl. (1900; Pyrenomycetes). — TYPONYM: *Phaeolus* (Pat.) Pat. (1900), *Spongiosus* (Lloyd) ex Torrend (1920), and *Choriphyllum* Velen. (1922). — STATUS. Impriorable as a later homonym.

Rommellia.—See *Romellia.*

Sacsia.—See *Saesia.*
Saesia.—See *Sesia.*

Sarcoporia P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **33**: 15. 1894; Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 3: 18. 1898 [= *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **62**: 82. 1903]. — ETYMOLOGY: σάρξ, σαρκός, flesh; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Sarcoporia polyspora* P. Karst.—According to Lowe (*in* Mycologia **48**: 122.

1956) this is the same as what Karsten had previously called *Physisporus aurantiacus* var. *saloisensis* P. Karst. ("*taloisensis*") and which differs from typical *Poria aurantiaca* (Rostk.) Sacc. of modern authors only as to the size of the pores, which are smaller (Lowe, op. cit., p. 110). — It has been suspected that the type was conspecific with *Polyporus sanguinolentus* (A. & S.) per Fr. and, hence, possibly a synonym of *Podoporia* P. Karst. (Donk, *1933:* 158). Lowe's revision of Karsten's types has shown that there are no grounds for these conjectures.

Scalaria Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 741. 1916; Polip Fl. españ. 126. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: scalaria, staircase. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Scalaria fusca* Lázaro = ? — REMARK. A nomen dubium until *Scalaria fusca* is properly identified.

Scenidium (Klotzsch) O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 515. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: σκηνίδιον, small tent, stage. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Polyporus wightii* Klotzsch.—Referred to *Hexagona apiaria* (Pers.) Fr. by Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **3** (Syn. Hex.): 6–7 *f. 279.* 1910]. — BASINYM: *Polyporus* trib. *Scenidium* Klotzsch *in* Linnaea **7**: 200. 1832.—Introduced for *Polyporus wightii.* — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. "*Scenidium* § Kl. 1832 Linnaea VII: 200 tab. 10" was used by Kuntze as a generic name to replace "*Hexagona* Fries 1838 Epicrisis 496 'Pollini' sed non Pollini". It is consequently validly published by means of a reference and, therefore, the only original species of its basinym must be taken as type. — REMARKS. Murrill (*1903:* 97, 101) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 88) considered the generic name as based on *Favolus hirtus* P. Beauv., perhaps because that was the first species Kuntze mentioned. — See also "Remarks" under *Hexagona* Pollini per Fr.

Schizopora Velen., České Houby 638. 1922. — ETYMOLOGY: σχίζω, I split; πόρος, pore. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): "*P*[*olyporus*] *laciniatus sp. n.* (*Poria lac.*, *Schizopora lac.*)."—According to Pilát (*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 458. 1941) this is a synonym of *Poria versipora* (Pers.) Baxter. — VALID PUBLICATION. In the observation to his new species *Polyporus laciniatus*, Velenovský remarked: "*Poria* mirabilis, certe genus proprium creans (*Schizopora*). Tubularum loco vero reticulae angulatae oriuntur et serius laciniae divisae" (translated from the Czech by Pilát, Velen. Sp. nov. Bas. 243. 1948). This shows that Velenovský not only definitely introduced an alternative name but also supplied a generic description: the name appears validly published (Code 1956: Art. 33). — TYPONYM. Compare *Chaetoporellus* Bond. & Sing. apud Sing. (1944).

Scindalma [Hill] O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **3** (2): 517. 1898. — ETYMOLOGY: σκινδάλμος, piece of cleft wood. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): "*Scindalma laminis tenuioribus* Hill l.c." of which Kuntze accepted the identity with *Polyporus igniarius* (L.) per Fr. Hill's species is in reality based on a species of Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 121 *pl. 62.* 1729, *Agaricum* Ordo IV). He copied the lower figure

of Micheli's plate. It is the same species on which *Mison* Adans., q.v., is based. — PRE-LINNEAN BASINYM: *Scindalma* Hill, General nat. Hist. **2**: 33. 1751.—Introduced for polypores with clearly layered hymenophore. Two original species. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. The name was validly published by Kuntze by means of a reference to the description given by Hill. This makes the scope that of Hill's original genus. However, simultaneously Kuntze took up *Scindalma* as an earlier name for *Fomes* (Fr.) "Cooke" as compiled in Saccardo's "Sylloge":

"*Scindalma* John Hill 1751 Natural History of Plants II: 33 = *Mison* Ad. 1763 Fam. II: 10 ex parte ½ clare = *Fomes* Cooke ex § Fries 1851 . . . Saccardo VI: 150 . . . verweist auf Fries Nov. Symb. Myc. 1851. . . ."—O. Kuntze (l.c.).

— TYPIFICATION. Since Kuntze did not supply a description, the type species must be one of Hill's fungi in its original sense. The species indicated above was considered type by Kuntze himself. — TYPONYMS: *Mison* Adans. (1763; devalidated name , and compare *Boletus* S. F. Gray (1821; preoccupied), and *Pseudofomes* Lázaro (1916).

Sclerodepsis Cooke *in* Grevillea **19**: 49. 1890. — ETYMOLOGY: σκληρός, hard; δέψω, I knead, I make flexible. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Trametes sclerodepsis* Berk. = *Sclerodepsis berkeleyi* Cooke.—This species is synonymous with *Trametes actinopila* Mont., according to Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **14**: 229. 1916). — SCOPE. Introduced with four species. — TYPIFICATION. The presence among the original species of one called *Trametes sclerodepsis* and renamed *Sclerodepsis berkeleyi* cannot be regarded as devoid of any importance in this connection. I follow Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) in taking it as type species. — The mechanical application of the first-species rule lead Murrill (*1903:* 94, 101) and W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 97; *1953:* 88) to *Trametes colliculosa* Berk. [not *T. colliculosa* (Pers.) Lundell].

Scutiger Paul. *per* Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **30**: 425. 1903; **32**: 482. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: scutiger, lance-bearer. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Scutiger tuberosus* Paul. = *Polyporus pes-caprae* Pers. per Fr. — DEVALIDATED BASINYM: *Scutiger* Paul.—See notes under *Agarico-carnis*. — VALID PUBLICATION. Murrill considered Paulet's name validly published (he cited "Paul. Icon. Champ. pl. 31 f. 1 3. 1793 [!]"). According to the present Code this is certainly not the case. It became validly published when Murrill took it up, with Paulet's first species of the "Iconographia" as type (cf. also Murrill, *1903:* 89, 101). — SCOPE. Introduced by Murrill for a group of which he described or mentioned 12 species.

Serda Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 11. 1763 (devalidated name). — This genus was introduced for "*Agaricus* Vaill. Bot. *t. 1. f. 3*" (= *Agaricus de St. Clou, nigerrimus* Vaill., Bot. paris. 3 *pl. 1 f. 3.* 1727), which is covered by the generic description and which is generally identified with *Lenzites sepiaria* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. (*Agaricus hirsutus* Schaeff.), a blackened fruit-body; compare Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 334. 1821) and Murrill (*1903:* 88; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 602. 1904). — See also

under *Sesia*. — Typonyms: *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. (1882), *Lenzitina* P. Karst. (1889), and *Sesia* Adans. per O.K. (1891).

Serpula (Pers.) per S. F. Gray.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 13. 1958).

Sesia Adans. *per* O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **2**: 869. 1891. — ETYMOLOGY: —. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (only original species): "*Agaricus* Vaill. Bot. *t. 1 f. 1, 2.*"—The fungus thus indicated (*Agaricus de St. Clou* Vaill., Bot. paris. 3 *pl. 1 fs. 1–2.* 1727) has been generally identified with *Lenzites sepiaria* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr. (*Agaricus hirsutus* Schaeff.); compare Fries (Syst. mycol. **1**: 334. 1821). As remarked by Murrill (*1903:* 88; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 602. 1904), Vaillant's figures upon which *Sesia* and *Serda*, q.v., are based were drawn from specimens collected on the timbers of a boat at St. Cloud, Paris. Vaillant's figures cited by Adanson for his genus *Sesia* were misinterpreted by O. Kuntze: "Die . . . Figuren . . . bei Vaillant t. 1 fig. 1, 2 identificirte mir Herr Hennings . . . sofort mit *Merulius lacrymans*."

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Sesia* Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 10. 1763.—Based on "*Agaricus* Vaill. Bot. *t. 1 f. 1, 2.*" This genus and *Serda* Adans. differed from each other only in their attachment, "Attaché par-dessous au centre seulement, sans tige" (*Sesia*) and, "Attaché par toute sa surface inférieure" (*Serda*).

VALID PUBLICATION, SCOPE, & TYPIFICATION. Kuntze re-introduced *Sesia* as a substitute for *Merulius* Fr. as compiled by Saccardo, trusting Henning's identification of the type species. The valid re-publication depends in this case on the accompanying description which is a reproduction of Adanson's ("Adanson gab folgende Diagnose für *Sesia*: . . .."). Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that Kuntze applied the name to replace *Merulius*, it acquired the status of a validly published name by a description which was drawn up from a fungus belonging to a quite different genus and it should be interpreted as based on Vaillant's fungus!

This conclusion thus conflicts with Kuntze's interpretation of the type species as (rather than an original designation of) *Merulius lacrimans* (Wulf.) per Fr., which he renamed *Sesia byssina* (Scop.) O.K. and which was accepted by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 89) for both *Sesia* Adans. ("Type: *Merulius lacrymans* Schum. ex Fr. but not as a binomial") and *Sesia* Adans. per O.K. ("Type: *S. byssina* Scop. ex O. Kuntze = *Merulius lacrymans* Schum. ex Fr."). Karsten (Finl. Basidsv. 141. 1899) was one of the very few mycologists to take up the name "*Sesia* Ad." He used it for what he himself had previously called *Serpula* (Pers.) P. Karst. (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 13. 1958) and *Gyrophana* Pat. His only Finnish species was *Merulius lacrimans* (but it should be remembered that in the cited work only a selection of the Finnish basidiomycetes was admitted).

REMARKS.: *Sesia* was again taken up, this time for *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst., by Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 602. 1904; type species, "*Agaricus hirsutus* Schaeff."), with Vaillant's fungus correctly interpreted. Afterwards he rejected it again because it was "not associable with a binomial species" (Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 370. 1905).

VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Saesia*"; Endl., Gen. Pl. 39. 1836 (as a synonym). — "*Sacsia*"; Endl., Ench. bot. 21. 1841 (as a synonym).—Evidently a misprint for '*Saesia*'. — TYPONYMS: *Serda* Adans. (1763; devalidated name), *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. (1882), and *Lenzitina* P. Karst. (1889).

Sisotrema.—See *Sistotrema* Pers. per Pers.

Sistotrema Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 426. Jan. 1, 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: σειστός, shaking; τρῆμα, hole. Gender: n.

TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Sistotrema confluens* Pers. per Fr.

REMARKS. This is not a mere misapplication of *Sistotrema* Pers. (see *Sistotrema* Pers. per Nocca & Balbis ex Fries Spec. Syst. mycol. 7. 1818) rejected that genus: "Huic genus *Sistotrema* e *Merulliis*, *Polyporis*, *Hydnis*, *Daedaleis* conflatum, plane delendum." In 1821 he called his genus "*Sistotrema*. Fries"; did not mention Persoon at all in synonymy; and emphatically remarked: ". . . ab homonymo genere Persoonii diversum; cum vero ad hoc relatum fuit ejusque species [alibi] disposui, nomen retinendum putavi." And compare Fries, Syst. Orb. veg. 362. 1825!

The listing of a generic name "*Sistotrema* Pers. em. Bond. & Singer Ann. Mycol. **39**: 48. 1941. . . . Type: *Trechispora onusta* Karst." by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 89) is due to a complicated confusion.

TYPONYMOUS HOMONYM: *Sistotrema* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 648. 1821. — Gray's genus ("*Sistotrema*. Persoon") was an emendation of Persoon's, with the exclusion of *Sistotrema cinereum* Pers. = *Boletus unicolor* Bull. = *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr., a species transferred to *Cerrena* S. F. Gray, q.v., and the only one eligible as type of *Sistotrema* Pers. Gray's (British) species were *Sistotrema bienne* (Bull.) Pers. and *S. confluens*; his generic description runs, "Stem distinct; cap round." Since in view of Gray's generic circumscription and description Persoon's type is not available, it seems in order to select *S. confluens* as type species of *Sistotrema* S. F. Gray (non Pers.), as was done by Maas Geesteranus (*in* Persoonia **1**: 141. 1959), and thus reduce it to a (later) typonymous homonym of *Sistotrema* Fr.

VARIANT SPELLING: "*Systotrema*"; Dumort., Comm. bot. 83. 1822 (no author mentioned); Krombh., Abb. Beschr. Schwämme H. 1: 63. 1831 ("Pers."), etc.—Apparently an error. Krombholz followed Fries's classification, hence the listing of this variant under the present name. — "*Sistrotonema*"; [Roum.] *in* Rev. mycol. **11**: 55. 1889.—Evidently an error of printing. — HOMONYM: *Sistotrema* Pers. per Nocca & Balbis (1821; 'Polyporaceae'). — ISONYM: *Hydnotrema* Link (1833).

Sistotrema Pers. *per* Nocca & Balbis, Fl. ticin. **2**: 340. 1821; Pers., Mycol. europ. **2**: 191. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: σειστός, shaking; τρῆμα, hole. Gender: n.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Sistotrema cinereum* Pers. = *Daedalea unicolor* (Bull.) per Fr.

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Sistotrema* Pers. *in* Neues Mag. Bot. **1**: 108. 1794 (= Tent. 28. 1797).—Introduced with two species, *Sistotrema confluens* Pers. (*Hydnum sublamellosum* Bull.), first species, and *S. cinereum*. Some years afterwards (Persoon, Syn.

Fung. 550. 1801) the number of species was increased to a dozen, of which the first and second were *S. rufescens* Pers. and *S. bienne* (Bull.) Pers.

SCOPE. Nocca & Balbis gave no author's citation, but their generic description shows that they accepted Persoon's genus (1801) unaltered: "Hymenium primo porosum, deinde in dentes compressos lacerum." They listed only one species in their regional flora, viz. *Sistotrema quercinum* (Pers.) Pers. — When Persoon republished this generic name in 1825 the species numbered 30; all those already mentioned above were included, but the order of treatment was reversed, the stipitate species coming at the end.

TYPIFICATION. It was without hesitation that Donk (*in* Fungus **26**: 4. 1956) selected Persoon's second species of 1794, *Sistotrema cinereum*, as type of Persoon's name of 1825. It agrees decidedly better with the original description (1794) which contains "Pileo suberoso", the substance of this species being given as "suberosum". (In 1794 the substance of *S. confluens* was not defined, but compare "Substantia carnosa, mollis" in 1801.) In other respects, too, *S. cinereum* agrees better with the original description. In 1825 the generic description contains, "Pileus coriaceus" and the description of *S. confluens*, "pileo carnosa"! In my opinion Link (Handb. Gewächse **3**. 1833) acted correctly at that time by retaining *Sistotrema* Pers. for *S. cinereum* and introducing a new name, *Hydnotrema* Link, for *S. confluens* (genus *Sistotrema* Fr.).

Banker (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **29**: 438, 448. 1902) and W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 89) considered the first species, *Sistotrema confluens* (*Hydnum sublamellosum* Bull.), type of the name as originally published (1794). Clements & Shear (*1931:* 346) suggested the same species for *Sistotrema* Pers. "1797".

REMARK. After the starting-point date of these fungi, S. F. Gray was perhaps the first to re-publish this generic name, but he misapplied it by excluding the type species (see preceding name).

VARIANT SPELLINGS: "*Sistrema*": Lühnemann *in* J. Bot. (ed. Schrad.), Gött. **3** (3 & 4): 51. 1809. — "*Sisotrema*": Rafin., Anal. Nat. ou Tabl. Univ. 211. 1815 (see under *Lamyxis*, p. 232 of the present paper); Ann. Nat. ou ann. Synop. 16. 1820. — "*Systotrema*": C. Nees, Syst. Pilze 225. 1816; Dumort., Comm. bot. 83. 1822 (nomen). — "*Systoma*"; Mérat, Nouv. Fl. Env. Paris, 2e Ed., **1**: 39. 1821 (as a synonym). — HOMONYM: *Sistotrema* Fr. (1821; 'Polyporaceae'), q.v. — TYPONYMS: *Cerrena* S. F. Gray (1821) and *Phyllodontia* P. Karst. (1883). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Sistrema.—See *Sistotrema* Pers. per Pers.
Sistrotonema.—See *Sistotrema* Fr.

Skeletocutis Kotlaba & Pouz. *in* Česká Mykol. **12**: 103, 104. 1958. — ETYMOLOGY: σκελετός, skeleton; cutis, skin. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus amorphus* Fr. per Fr.

Solenia Pers. per Fr.—'Cyphellaceae' (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 219. 1951).

Somion Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 5. 1763 (devalidated name). — Introduced for a part of Micheli's *Agaricum* ordo VI (Nov. Pl. Gen. 122. 1729) of which Micheli's illustrations were cited (*pl. 64 fs. 3–5*, corresponding to species nos. 4–6). For these species the names *Hydnum occarium* Batsch [per Fr.], *H. orbiculatum* Pers. [per Fr.], and *H. pectinatum* Fr. were coined. They are all doubtful as far as our present knowledge goes: I am not aware that they have ever been satisfactorily identified. — *Somion* is a non-Linnean name, never taken up afterwards, but if the starting-point date for these fungi had not been altered, it would have been accepted as validly published.

Spathulina Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 73. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: spathula, spatula. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Irpex lamellosus* Pat.

Spongioides Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid. **14**: 574. 1916; Polip. Fl. espań. 75. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: spongia, sponge; -oides, resembling. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES only original species): *Boletus cryptarum* Bull. sensu Lázaro =? — REMARK. A nomen dubium until the type species is properly identified.

Spongiosus Lloyd *ex* Torrend *in* Brotéria (Sér. bot.) **18**: 121. 1920; **21**: 39. 1924. — ETYMOLOGY: spongiosus, spongy. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus schweinitzii* Fr. — BASINYM: "Stipitate Polyporoids" sect. *Spongiosus* Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3** (Stip. Pol.): 157. 1912.—This in its turn was undoubtedly derived from *Polyporus* trib. *Mesopus* sect. *Spongiosi* Fr., Epicr. 432. 1838 = *Polyporus* stirps *Spongiosa* Fr. *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III 1: 50. 1851 (= Nov. Symb. 34; no description). Fries introduced it for such species as *Polyporus schweinitzii* and *P. biennis* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr. From his "Hymenomycetes europaei" (p. 528–530; *Polyporus* I. *Mesopus* C. *Spongiosi*) it appears that in later work he retained such species as *P. schweinitzii*, *P. rufescens* (Pers.) per Fr., and *P. biennis* in the taxon until the end.[64] Lloyd defined the taxon as follows: "The section *Spongiosus* embraces those species with soft, light, spongy flesh. These characters are more strongly evident in dried specimens." Some outstanding examples of the species he referred here were *Polyporus rufescens* — *P. biennis*, and *P. schweinitzii*. — SCOPE & VALID PUBLICATION. The generic name was first published in a key to the genera of the stipitate polypores; this key was preceded by the remark. "Comme [M. Lloyd], nous diviserons les Polyporacées stipitées de la façon suivante." On this occasion no species were dealt with: the genus was to be treated in a subsequent instalment of Torrend's paper. The original scope of his genus must be accepted as being that of Lloyd's cited section. — The treatment of the genus appeared a few years later: "Le genre *Spongiosus* appartient tout entier au *Polyporus*, et en forme une section assez naturelle . . .." Two of the six Brasilian species dealt with are "*Sp. rufescens* Pers." (first species) and "*Sp. Schweinitzii* Fr."

[64] In the "Monographia" (**2**: 251. 1863) it would appear from the species listed that Fries temporarily combined the '*Spongiosi*' and the '*Subcoriacei*' under the denomination of '*Polysticti*.' The '*Subcoriacei*' comprised such species as *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr. and *P. perennis* (L.) per Fr.

TYPIFICATION. In my opinion there are only two species really eligible, viz. *Polyporus biennis* (*P. rufescens*) and *P. schweinitzii*. Of these I select the latter as type species. — REMARK. See also "Remarks" under *Lentus*. — TYPONYMS: *Phaeolus* (Pat.) Pat. (1900) and *Romellia* Murrill (1904).

Spongipellis Pat., Hym. Eur. 140. 1887. — ETYMOLOGY: spongia, sponge; pellis, skin. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species mentioned by name): *Polyporus spumeus* (Sow.) per Fr.[65] — SCOPE. "*S. spumeus* et quelques autres."— Patouillard (l.c.).

Spongiporus Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 474. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: σπόγγος, sponge; πόρος pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus leucospongia* Cooke & Harkness.—For a recent description of this species, see Overholts (*1953:* 289).

Stereofomes J. Rick.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 114. 1957).

Stigmatolemma Kalchbr.—'Cyphellaceae' (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 219. 1951).

Striglia "S. F. Gray".—See *Strilia* S. F. Gray.

Striglia Adans. *per* O.K., Rev. Gen. Pl. **2**: 871. 1891. — ETYMOLOGY: striglia, Italian for currey-comb.[66] Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): "*Agaricus daedalaeis sinibus excavatus* Tou. J.R.H. 562" Batt., Fung. Agri arimin. Hist. 72 *pl. 38 f. A.* 1755.—This species (at least as to the specimen depicted) was identified by Persoon (in his copy of Battarra's work at Leiden) with *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr., correctly so I believe. O. Kuntze also accepted it as representing that species on the authority of Streinz (Nomencl. Fung. 37. 1861).

DEVALIDATED NAME: *Striglia* Adans., Fam. Pl. **2**: 10. 1763.—Adanson did not mention any species by name, but he cited Battarra's plate 38 on which some species agreeing with his description are depicted; one of these is the fungus discussed above. Another one is *Agaricus daedalaeis sinibus excavatus nigricans* Batt. (op. cit. *pl. 38 f. B*; reference to this figure omitted in the text). This, too, is well recognizable as *Daedalea quercina*.

VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. Since Kuntze (in addition to the reference to the pre-Friesian name) reproduced Adanson's description, he secured the valid re-publication of the name for precisely the same genus as Adanson's, and his 'original' species are those of Adanson's. However, because he took Adanson's name as validly published, he felt bound to restore it for *Daedalea* "Pers. 1801"

---

[65] Mentioned by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 91) as *Boletus* "*squamosus*" Sow.
[66] See also footnote 68, under *Strilia* S. F. Gray.

as he found that genus compiled by Saccardo (Syll. Fung. **6**: 370. 1888).

TYPIFICATION. In view of the generic name and the 'author's citation' given by Adanson ("Ital."), it is likely that Adanson primarily had in mind a fungus which had been called striglia in Italy. This points to the fungus selected here as type species[67] and indicated above, and which corresponds to one of Micheli's species of *Agaricum* (Nov. Pl. Gen. 120. 1729, Ordo III sp. 3); in connection with it, Micheli listed as popular Italian names "Lingua dura, cattiva, detta altrimenti Striglia."

W. B. Cooke (*1953*: 92) gave *Daedalea aurea* Fr. as type species for both *Striglia* Adans. and *Striglia* Adans. per O.K.; it is a doubtful species. This specific name was introduced for "*Agaricus aureus* &c. Batt. p. 72 [*pl. 35 f. F.*]" (Pers., Syn. Fung. 500. 1801; Fries, Syst. mycol. 1: 339. 1821). The reason for this indication was not stated, but is was Kuntze's 'first' species.

HOMONYM. Compare *Strilia* S. F. Gray (1821; 'Polyporaceae'). — TYPONYMS: *Agarico-fungus* Haller (1742; pre-Linnean name), *Agarico-suber* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. (1821), and *Agaricus* Murrill (1905; preoccupied). — STATUS. Apparently impriorable on account of the earlier, but orthographically different, homonym.

Strilia S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. **1**: 645. 1821. — ETYMOLOGY: striglia, Italian for currey-comb.[68] Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Boletus cinnamomeus* Jacq.—A close relative of *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr.; formerly the two were often taken to be conspecific. — REMARKS. The generic description contains the word "fleshy", which does not agree with the only species treated. Gray obviously made an error of translation when he wrote 'fleshy': Persoon (Syn. Fung. 515. 1801), who stated about *Boletus cinnamomeus*, "A *B. perenni* L. differt imprimis substantia", called the fungus "fragilis". Jacquin's original description (Collect. **1**: 116. 1786; reproduced by Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 343. 1904) contains, ". . . nec putrefecit, fragilis . . .." — Gray called the genus "*Strilia*. Micheli". There is no such generic name to be found in Micheli's work; but see footnote to "Etymology". — See also "Remarks" under *Polystictus*. — VARIANT SPELLING. Donk (*in* Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III **18**: 145. 1949; Summ. Prop. 4. 1950) modified the spelling from *Strilia* into *Striglia*; it may be assumed from Micheli's popular name adopted by Gray, as well as from Gray's British popular name ("Striglia"), that he intended the spelling with 'g'. — HOMONYM: Compare *Striglia* Adans. per O.K. (1891; 'Polyporaceae'), q.v.

---

[67] And compare Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 84. 1905): "The genus *Striglia* [Adans.] was founded upon Battarra's plate 38, which represents several common species of *Agaricus* [= *Daedalea*], the first being *A. quercinus* L." The latter species Murrill (op. cit. **32**: 491. 1905) definitely accepted as type of Adanson's generic name.

[68] Compare Micheli (Nov. Pl. Gen. 120. 1729) who mentioned under *Agaricum* Ordo III species 3: "Lingua dura, cattiva, detta altrimenti Striglia"; and cited as a synonym: "*Fagi Fungus Striliis* [= *Strigilis*] *usum praebens* Aldrovr. Dendr. 250." Aldrovandi's (depicted) fungus also, very likely, represents *Daedalea quercina*. A strigil (Lat. strigilis) is a skin-scraper used by ancients at bath.

Sulphurina Pilát *ex* Pilát *in* Acta Mus. nat. Prag. B **9** (2): 109. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: sulphureus, sulphur-coloured. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Sistotrema sulphureum* (Quél.) Bourd. & G. — PROTONYM: *Sulphurina* Pilát *in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 473. 1942 (nomen nudum).—Introduced for two species of which *Sistotrema sulphureum* was indicated as type species. No Latin description in addition to the French one. — TYPIFICATION. The obvious choice is *Sistotrema sulphureum*.

Systoma.—See *Sistotrema* Pers. per Pers.
Systotrema.—See *Sistotrema* Fr.

Tädalea.—See *Daedalea*.

Thelepora.—See *Theleporus*.

Theleporus Fr. *in* K. svenska VetenskAkad. Öfvers. **4**: 106–107. 1847 ("*Thelepora*") (German translation by Hornschuch *in* Hornsch. Beitr. scand. Naturgesch. **2**: 338. 1847[69]; and cf. *in* Bot. Ztg **6**: 340. Apr. 28, 1848); *in* K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl. **1848**: 138 (= Fung. natal. 18. 1848); Summa Veg. Scand. **2**: 325. 1849. — ETYMOLOGY: θηλή, nipple; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species, named in 1848): *Theleporus cretaceus* Fr.—For a recent description, see Talbot (*in* Bothalia **6**: 63 *text-pl. 18*. 1951); and compare W. B. Cooke (*in* Mycologia **49**: 683. 1957). — VALID PUBLICATION. Although the 'official' publication occurred in "Fungi natalenses" (1848), the name appeared already in print the year before. The German translation of this preliminary account in Hornschuch's "Archiv" runs as follows:

"Mycologische Notizen. In der Sitzung am 10. März 1847 . . . Hr. Fries . . . So ist *Thelepora* ein *Polyporus*, aber mit einer regelmässig verlängertem Papille innerhalb jedes Porus, eine ganz eigentümmliche Combination aus den beiden Hauptgattungen *Polyporus* und *Hydnum*."

— VARIANT SPELLING: "*Thelepora*": Fr., l.c., 1847.—This is the earliest spelling published, but it would appear from the formal publication by Fries in 1848 that he preferred the spelling ending in —us, which is the one always used afterwards. — "*Theloporus*": Clem., Gen. Fungi 110. 1909; Clem. & Shear, Gen. Fungi 348. 1931.—Intended as a correction.

Theloporus.—See *Theleporus*.

Thwaitesiella Mass.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 118. 1957).
Thwaitsiella.—See *Thwaitesiella*.

---

[69] This date is not quite clear from the copy I consulted. If not in 1847, it was at least published in the first months of 1848 and not later; this also follows from the reproduction of the description in the "Botanische Zeitung". Krok (Bibl. bot. suec. 209. 1925) gives "1850".

Tilotus Kalchbr.—See 'Agaricaceae' (to be published).

Tinctoporia Murrill *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 14. 1907. — ETYMOLOGY: tinctum, dipped in some dye; the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and original species): "*Tinctoporia aurantiotingens* Murrill" = *Poria fuligo* var. *aurantiotingens* Ell. & Macbr. This is *Poria borbonica* Pat., according to Bresadola *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **14**: 228. 1916); Murrill (*in* Mycologia **13**: 122. 1921) and Lowe *in* Lloydia **21**: 102. 1959) refer it to *Poria albocincta* Cooke & Mass. apud Cooke.

Tomentifolium Murrill.—See 'Agaricaceae' (to be published).

Tomophagus Murrill *in* Torreya **5**: 197. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: τόμος, cut-off portion; -φάγος, -eating. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species, also of basinym): *Polyporus colossus* Fr. = *Ganoderma colossus* (Fr.) Bose. — BASINYM: *Dendrophagus* Murrill (1905), q.v. — REMARK. A name change, the basinym being preoccupied.

[*Tortula* Hedw. per Hedw. (Musci frondosi). — In Pfeiffer (Nomencl. bot. **2**: 1431. 1874 one will find the following entry: "*Tortula* Ritgen 1831 in Schr. Marb. Ges. II. p. 91: g. Spondylomycetum („Nees fig. CCXVII", quae *Boletum cristatum* monstrat.)." Ritgen (Ueber innere u. äuss. Bewegung PflReiche 51. 1828 = *in* Schr. Ges. Beförd. ges. Naturw. Marburg **2**: 91. 1831) did not really introduce a new generic name, but committed some errors. In a survey of genera with the supergeneric groups shortly characterized, he mentioned as representatives of one of these groups: "*Stilbospora* 17 . *Exosporium* (30). *Antennaria* (298). Ob auch *Tortula* (CCXVII ?" The numbers after the names refer to figures published by Nees (Syst. Pilze. 1816). "CCXVII" is an error for "CCXCVII", a figure of the paraphyses and antheridia of a frondose moss ("Die sogenannten männliche Organe der *Tortula tortuosa*." —Nees, Syst. Pilze, Ueberbl. 72. 1817). Nees had added this figure for comparison with *Ascobolus* Pers., the apothecia of which mainly consist of paraphyses and big asci. Ritgen apparently failed to realize that the figure depicted only a small portion of a moss-plant: his mention of *Tortula* is a tentative classification of a genus of Musci among the Fungi, not the introduction of a new name.]

Trachyderma (Imazeki) Imazeki *in* Bull. Govt Forest Exp. Sta., Tokyo No. 57: 97. 1952. — ETYMOLOGY: τραχύς, rough; δέρμα, skin. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES: (only original species of basinym and by original designation for generic name) *Ganoderma tsunodae* (Yasuda) Trotter. — BASINYM: *Ganoderma* subgen. *Trachyderma* Imazeki *in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 1: 49. 1939.—Introduced for one species, *Ganoderma tsunodae*. — SCOPE. Two species were listed for the genus. — HOMONYM: *Trachyderma* Norm. (1853; Lichenes, Pannariaceae). — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Trametella Pinto-Lopes *in* Mem. Soc. broter. **8**: 160. 1952. — ETYMOLOGY: diminutive of *Trametes*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Trametes hispida* Bagl.—The correct name for this fungus should perhaps be derived from *Polyporus gallicus* Fr., for which see page 210.

Trametes Fr., Fl. scan. 339. 1835; Gen. Hym. 11. 1836; Epicr. 488. 1838. — ETYMOLOGY: trama, the woof. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus suaveolens* (L.) per Fr.

SCOPE. No species were mentioned in 1835; a few, briefly, in 1836; the genus was fully treated in 1838.

TYPIFICATION: *Polyporus suaveolens* (the first of the species mentioned in 1836) has been considered type by Murrill (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 477. 1905; **32**: 637. 1906; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 42. 1907), Donk (*1933:* 185, as *Daedalea suaveolens* Fr.), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 60; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Imazeki (*1943:* 66), Bondartsev (*1953:* 46), Overholts (*1953:* 133), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 159). This is quite acceptable as it is one of the few more eligible species especially mentioned by Fries in 1836 (l.c.): "Duo typi sed in se invicem transeuntes: *) poris subrotundis: *Polyp. suaveolens* et affines **) poris linearibus: *Daedal. gibbosa*, *elegans*, *rubescens* etc."

Karsten (*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **48**: 335. 1889) restricted the genus to dark (brown) coloured species before any species was considered type. In view of the original species (1836), none of which has a dark coloured context, this act does not warrant the selection of any of the species he admitted to his emendation.

The 'selection' of *Daedalea pini* (Brot.) per Fr., by Clements & Shear (*1931:* 347) is recorded here without comment.

Murrill (*1903:* 92, 101), before having noted the earlier publication of 1836, and when still considering *Trametes* introduced in 1838, took the name as based on *Trametes benzoina* (Wahlenb.: Fr.) Fr. = *Polyporus benzoinus* (Wahlenb.) Fr., the first species in the "Epicrisis"; he was followed only by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 88; *1953:* 95).

Finally, Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept. sci. indust. Res., New Zeal. No. 80: 1, 2. 1948) selected *Trametes hispida* Bagl.

Trechispora P. Karst. *in* Hedwigia **29**: 147. 1890; Krit. Öfvers. Finl. Basidsv. Tillägg 2: 24. 1893 [= *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **54**: 178. 1894]. — ETYMOLOGY: τρηχύς, rough; σπορά, seed. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Trechispora onusta* P. Karst.—According to Donk (*in* Fungus **26**: 7–8. 1956) this species has been differently interpreted. First, as a smooth-spored one, a conception introduced by Bresadola (*in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **6**: 41. 1909), who reported that material from Karsten himself was a mixtum compositum of a smooth-spored species of *Poria* [70] and a fungus with aculeolate conidia, 4 × 3–4 μ in diameter, which perhaps were taken for the spores of the

[70] Bresadola called the spores "minutissime asperulae vel laeves".

former by Karsten. If this statement applies to the type, the generic as well as the specific name had better be rejected in agreement with the Code, because two different fungi were involved in what was thought to be a single (individual) plant. The species of *Poria* that Bresadola encountered was presumably the one with urniform basidia described by Bourdot & Galzin (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **41**: 218. 1925; Hym. France 658. 1928) and Rogers (*in* Mycologia **36**: 80 *f.* 1. 1944). Secondly, Rogers (op. cit., pp. 75–76) considered Karsten's species to be quite smooth-spored and ignored the aculeolate conidia which Bresadola had noticed; the latter were absent in the specimen that Rogers studied and selected as lectotype at that time, and which he identified with the *Poria onusta* (P. Karst.) Sacc. of Boudot & Galzin (who ascribed the combination to Bresadola). Because the character of the rough spores induced Karsten to establish the genus and name it accordingly, this interpretation appeared highly questionable. Thirdly, Lowe (*in* Mycologia **48**: 123. 1956) stated that Karsten's species is identical with *Poria candidissima* (Schw.) Cooke, "according to the Lectotype selected from a Karsten collection at the New York Botanical Garden by D. P. Rogers, a portion of which is now at Helsinki. This collection is the only one known which agrees with the original description, which stated that the spores were echinulate."[71] This solution would seem to be fully acceptable, and is in agreement with cases in which it is recorded that Karsten confused outwardly similar fungi. Because *P. candidissima* has non-urniform basidia Rogers's application of *Trechispora* must be rejected.

It may be indicated that Donk (*1933*: 217) had already remarked that *Trechispora onusta* should go into *Poria* sect. *Subtiles* Bourd. & G., a taxon to which *Poria candidissima* belongs, and from which he excluded the species with urniform basidia (one of which is *Poria onusta* sensu Bourd. & G.). When he referred *Trechispora onusta* to *Poria* sect. *Subtiles*, he had studied Karsten's specimen at Uppsala, of which Romell [*in* Ark. Bot. **11** (3): 11. 1911] wrote: "The authentic specimen of *Trechispora onusta* Karst. seems to contain two species, viz. *Pol. hymenocystis* B. & Br. and the species [described as *Polyporus albolutescens* Romell]. As Karsten refers his plant to a separate genus with echinulate spores, which occur in *P. hymenocystis* [— *Poria candidissima* (Schw.) Cooke] only, I think it unadvisable to apply his name 'onustus' to [*P. albolutescens*]."

VARIANT SPELLING: "*Trechisporia*": Imazeki *in* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6: 68. 1943 (incidental mention). — HOMONYM. *Trachyspora* Fuck. (1861; Uredinales) might perhaps be regarded as an earlier homonym: the dictionary gives τραχύς as a variant of τρᾱχύς. — STATUS. Impriorable if considered a later homonym, or if eventually found to be based on a mixtum compositum.

Trechisporia.—See *Trechispora*.

---

[71] For a mention of material of Karsten of *Trechispora onusta* in Bresadola's herbarium, see Baxter (*in* Pap. Michigan Acad. Sci. **28**: 228. 1942), who recorded it as belonging to *Poria albolutescens* (Romell) Egel. For another package, containing *Poria candidissima*, see below.

Trichamptum.—See *Trichaptum.*

Trichaptum Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **31**: 608. 1904; **32**: 359. 1905. — ETYMOLOGY: θρίξ, τριχός, hair; ἅπτω, I fix upon, I cling to. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Polyporus trichomallus* Berk. & Mont.—For a recent description of this species, see Overholts (*1953:* 341). — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Trichamptum*": W. B. Cooke, Gen. Homobas. 95. 1953 (incidental mention).—Presumably an error.

Truncospora Pilát *ex* Pilát *in* Acta Mus. nat. Prag. B **9** (2): 108. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: trunco, I cut off; σπορά, spore. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus ochroleucus* Berk. — PROTONYM: *Truncospora* Pilát *in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 365. 1941 (nomen nudum).—Introduced with *Polyporus ochroleucus* and *Trametes ohiensis* Berk. = *Fomes ohiensis* (Berk.) Murrill; "La seconde ne paraît q'un synonyme de la première." No Latin description in addition to the French one. — TYPIFICATION. The obvious choice is *Polyporus ochroleucus.* This species was listed as type by W. B. Cooke (*1953:* 96; for the name as published in 1941) and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*in* Česká Mykol. **13**: 32. 1959).

"*Tuberaster* Boccone Museoli Fisica e di Esperienza. Venice 1697" is cited by W. B. Cooke (Gen. Homobas. 96. 1953; incidental mention), with the annotation, "Type: not based on a binomial (*P. tuberaster* Fr.)." This species is also the selected type species of *Polyporus* [Mich.] Fr. per Fr. (1821) and *Cerioporus* Quél. (1886).

Tubulina.—See *Fistulina.*

Tylotus.—See *Tilotus.*

Tyromyces P. Karst. *in* Rev. mycol. **3**/No. 9: 17. 1881. — ETYMOLOGY: τῡρός cheese; μύκης, fungus. Gender: m.

TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus chioneus* Fr.—It is still not known to-day what *P. chioneus* of Fries and Karsten is precisely. The best suggestion at hand is perhaps the one which identifies Fries's fungus with *Polyporus albidus* (Schaeff.) per Trog. apud Fr. sensu Bres., Bourd. & G. = *P. stipticus* Pers. per Fr.; compare Romell (*in* Svensk bot. Tidskr. **20**: 3, 41. 1926). It is certainly not *Polyporus semipileatus* Peck which is called *Polyporus chioneus* Fr. by Bresadola and *Leptoporus chioneus* (Fr.) Quél. by Bourdot & Galzin.

SCOPE. Karsten mentioned two examples (the Finnish representatives): *Polyporus chioneus* and *P. pallescens* Fr.

TYPIFICATION. The first species has been indicated as type: Murrill (*1903:* 101; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 477. 1905; *in* N. Amer. Flora **9**: 30. 1907), Donk (*1933:* 142), Bondartsev & Singer (*1941:* 51; *apud* Singer, *1944:* 66), Cunningham (*in* Bull. Pl. Dis. Div., Dept sci. industr. Res., New Zeal. No. 74: 33. 1948), W. B. Cooke *1953:* 97), Bondartsev (*1953:* 38), and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 168).

REMARK. As originally conceived by Karsten, *Tyromyces* was apparently introduced for Fries's group *Polyporus* trib. *Apus* A. *Anodermei* sect. *Caseosi* * *Eupolypori* poris rotundis, integris, obtusis, edentulis (Fries, Hym. europ. 545. 1874) and of which only the last two species were listed by him as examples occurring in Finland, *Polyporus chioneus* and *P. pallescens* Fr. (the latter name presumably misapplied by him already at that time). Afterwards he fused *Tyromyces* with *Postia* Fr. emend. P. Karst. (see p. 273) and the resulting genus became approximately the same as *Leptoporus* Quél., although restricted by the exclusion of *Bjerkandera* P. Karst. Yet, the original species of the two names were different, since Karsten did not originally include the main-group of *Leptoporus* and the two cannot be made typonyms, although in recent years they have been used for approximately the same genus.

STATUS. See "Remarks" under *Postia*.

[*Underwoodina* O.K.—See under *Bizzozeriella*.]

Ungularia Lázaro *in* Rev. Acad. Madrid **14**: 668. 1916; Polip. Fl. Españ. 107. 1917. — ETYMOLOGY: ungula, hoof. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus betulinus* Bull. per Fr. — SCOPE. Introduced with nine species of which *Ungularia tuberosa* Lázaro was illustrated. — TYPIFICATION. The first species was indicated as type by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 98; *1953:* 97) and Imazeki (*1943:* 67). — TYPONYMS: *Piptoporus* P. Karst. (1881) and *Placoderma* (Ricken) Ulbrich (1928).

Ungulina Pat. *ex* Pat., Essai taxon. Hym. 102. 1900. — ETYMOLOGY: ungula, hoof. Gender: f.

TYPE SPECIES (selected for basinym): *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr.

PROTONYM: *Ungulina* Pat., Cat. rais. Pl. cell. Tunis. 48. 1897.—This is now regarded as the place of valid publication of the generic name, but the name appears there only as a nomen provisorium and, therefore, it was not validly published on that occasion. The first part of Patouillard's note runs:

"Le genre *Fomes* tel qu'il a été institué par Fries dans les Novae Symbolae comprend des séries d'espèces à affinités manifestement disparates; ainsi avons-nous dû lui donner un sens beaucoup plus restreint; pour nous, *Fomes* comprendra seulement les Polypores leucosporés a chapeau pourvu d'une croûte plus ou moins luisante, analogues à *F. fomentarius* Fr. et formant une série correspondant à *Ganoderma* dans les chromosporés. Cette série, à laquelle il serait bon de donner une désignation spéciale (*Ungulina*), peut se diviser en deux sections: . . ."

I have reproduced this part of the note to enable the verification of the following conclusions: (i) *Ungulina* as used in 1897 is indeed nothing but a provisional name, and (ii) is a mere name change for *Fomes* Fr., q.v., but in a radically emended circumscription. It was for the latter reason that Patouillard felt himself entitled to coin a new superfluous name, as was often done in similar cases at his time especially in France. — Patouillard's two sections contained *Polyporus ochroleucus* Berk. (first species) and three other species mentioned, and *P. fomentarius* and five other species mentioned.

BASINYM: *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. (1849), q.v.

SCOPE. When definitely establishing the name in 1900, Patouillard divided the genus into three main groups: (1) section *Fomentarius* Pat., with four subsections, of which the first contains *P*[*olyporus*] *ochroleucus* (first species) and the second, *P. fomentarius*; (2) section *Fomitopsis* (P. Karst.) Pat., with *Polyporus annosus* Fr., *P. marginatus* (Pers.) per Fr., etc.; and (3) section *Piptoporus* (P. Karst.) Pat., divided into two subsections, the first with *P. betulinus* (Bull.) per Fr., etc., the second with *P. fuliginosus* (Scop.) per Fr., etc.

TYPIFICATION. When *Ungulina* is accepted as an isonym of *Fomes*, as I believe should be the correct conclusion, its type species should automatically be that of the basinym, viz. *P. fomentarius*. If such a relation were to be rejected, the type species must be selected from those of the three sectional names. The most extensive section is *Ungulina* sect. *Fomentarius* Pat. (including, for instance, *P. fomentarius* as well as *P. ochroleucus*) and one will not hesitate to regard *P. fomentarius* again as type species. In addition, it was plainly stated to be the central species of *Ungulina* in the quoted note of 1897. All and all together there can be no doubt as to the correct typification of *Ungulina*.

Polyporus ochroleucus, which can stand only as a result of an extremely rigid application of the first-species rule, was indicated as type species by W. B. Cooke (*1940:* 98; *1953:* 97; for *Ungulina* 1897) and Kotlaba & Pouzar (*1957:* 168).

TYPONYMS: *Agarico-igniarium* Paul. (1793; devalidated name); *Pyreium* Paul. (circa 1812; devalidated name), *Placodes* Quél. (1886), *Elfvingiella* Murrill (1914), and compare also *Xylopilus* P. Karst. (1882; nomen monstrositatis?).

Volvopolyporus Lloyd *ex* Sacc. & Trott. *in* Sacc., Syll. Fung. **21**: 282. 1912. — ETYMOLOGY: volva; the genus *Polyporus*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Polyporus peronatus* S. Schulz.—This fungus has been a puzzle from the start and its identity not yet been satisfactorily established. It was referred to *Polystictus perennis* (L. per Fr.) P. Karst. by Pilát (*in* Atl. Champ. Eur., Prague **3**: 580. 1942). — PROTONYM: *Volvopolyporus* "McGinty"; Lloyd, Mycol. Writ. **3**: 444. 1909.—See also Stevenson & Cash *in* Bull. Lloyd Libr No. 35: 148. 1936: "This 'new genus' . . . is one of Mr. Lloyd's pleasantries and can be ignored, except to note that it has been recorded by Saccardo (l.c.)." For some general remarks on the not validly published 'McGinty' names, see Donk (*in* Reinwardtia **1**: 205. 1951). — VALID PUBLICATION. In my opinion this name was taxonomically accepted in the "Sylloge Fungorum", where it is accompanied by a Latin description, and hence I consider it validly published in that work. The case of *Cyanosporus* "McGinty", q.v., is quite different, this name being merely recorded by Saccardo under *Polyporus caesius*, and the latter denomination maintained. — TYPONYMS. The following names are based on *Polystictus perennis: Coltricia* S. F. Gray (1821), *Polystictus* Fr. (1851), *Pelloporus* Quél. (1886), and *Xanthochrous* Pat. (1897).

Vonckhout.—See *Vonkhout.*

Vonkhout Sterbeeck; Endl., Gen. Pl. **1**: 39. 1836; Ench. bot. 21. 1841; Pfeiffer, Syn. bot. 44. 1870 & Nomencl. bot. **2**: 1600. 1874 ("*Vonckhout*"); (as a synonym). — "Vonck-hout" is a pre-Tournefortian name, used by Sterbeeck (Theatr. Fung. 262. 1675). It is a Dutch or Flemish word that might be translated into English as 'sparkwood'. Sterbeeck described two species which he had seen himself; one (the first, no. 128) might have been resupinate growths of *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr., reason, perhaps, why *Vonkhout* was cited as a synonym of *Daedalea* Pers. by Endlicher and Pfeiffer. The other species, which Sterbeeck identified with Tragus's "Igniarij" and which "is het ghemeyn ende oprecht vonck-hout" (is the common and true sparkwood) he does not describe, but he stated that he had found it on a living, large oak: it presumably is *Fomes fomentarius* (L. per Fr.) Fr. If the name must be typified and cited as a synonym, it would be better to place it under *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. rather than *Daedalea*.

Whitfordia Murrill *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **35**: 407. 1908. — ETYMOLOGY: H. N. Whitford. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species : *Fomes warburgianus* P. Henn. sensu Murrill = *Polyporus scopulosus* Berk. — HOMONYM: *Whitfordia* Elmer (1910; Leguminosae).

Xanthochrous Pat., Cat. rais. Pl. cell. Tunis. 51. 1897. — ETYMOLOGY: ξανθός, yellow; χρώς, skin or colour. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Polyporus perennis* L., per Fr. — PROTONYM. *Xanthochrous* Pat. *in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **12**: 51. 1896.—This name was first introduced as a provisional (rather than as an alternative) one: see quotation under *Cycloporus* Murrill, from which it will appear that *Xanthochrous* may be considered as merely an enlarged genus *Pelloporus* Quél. — SCOPE. Introduced (in 1897) for a number of species grouped by the author in the following subdivisions: (i) "*Perennes* Fr.", with *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr. as the first, and *P. perennis* as the third species; (ii) "*Hispidi* Fr.", with *Polyporus hispidus* (Bull.) per Fr., *P. radiatus* (Sow.) per Fr., etc.; and (iii) "*Conchati*", with *Polyporus senex* Mont., *P. rimosus* Berk., *P. conchatus* Fr., *P. pini* (Brot. per Fr.) Fr., etc. — TYPIFICATION. By the epithets chosen for the subdivisions of the genus, the eligible species are the following three species: *P. perennis*, *P. hispidus*, and *P. conchatus*. The third species may be excluded from consideration because it was removed from the genus by Bourdot & Galzin (*in* Bull. Soc. mycol. France **41**: 192. 1925): these authors applied the name *Xanthochrous* in a somewhat emended circumscription and placed *P. conchatus* [as "*Phellinus salicinus* (Pers.) Quél."] in *Phellinus* Quél. Of the two remaining species, *P. perennis* has already been considered type by W. B. Cooke (*1940*: 98; *1953*: 99). — *Polyporus tomentosus*, the first species enumerated by Patouillard, was regarded as type by Murrill (*1903*: 97, 101; *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **32**: 363. 1905). It will be clear from the preceding account why this indication is rejected here. — REMARK. Pinto-Lopes (*in* Mem. Soc. broter. **8**: 164. 1952) has emended the genus, with exclusion of its type group, to such species as *Polyporus cuticularis* (Bull.) per Fr., *P. dryadeus* (Pers.) per Fr., *P. hispidus*, and *P. rheades* Pers.,

that is, to *Inonotus* P. Karst. (1879). The latter name is an earlier one for such a genus. — TYPONYMS: *Coltricia* S. F. Gray (1821), *Polystictus* Fr. (1851), and *Pelloporus* Quél. (1886); and compare *Volvopolyporus* Lloyd ex Sacc. & Trott. (1912).

Xanthoporia Murrill *in* Mycologia **8**: 56. 1916. — ETYMOLOGY: ξανθός, yellow, the genus *Poria*. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation and only original species): *Mucronoporus andersonii* Ell. & Ev.—Sometimes identified with resupinate specimens of *Polyporus glomeratus* Peck; compare Lloyd [Mycol. Writ. **5** (Lett. 66): 8. 1917; **5** (Lett. 69): 11. 1919] and Baxter (*in* Pap. Michigan Acad. Sci. **17**: 428. 1933). However, the two species are currently kept apart; compare Overholts (*in* Torreya **17**: 202–206 *pl. 1.* 1917; *1953:* 423 *pl. 55 f. 316, pl. 117 fs. 638, 639, pl. 130 fig.*) and Lowe (*in* Techn. Publ. New York St. Coll. For. No. 65: 80. 1946).

Xerotes.—See *Xerotus*.

Xerotinus Reichenb., Consp. Regni veg. 14. 1828. — ETYMOLOGY: derived from the name *Xerotes*. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species of basinym): *Xerotus afer* Fr. — BASINYM: *Xerotes* Fr. (1825) = *Xerotus* Fr. (1828), q.v. — REMARK. A name change for the preoccupied basinym.

Xerotus Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 78. 1825 (as *Xerotes*); Elench. **1**: 48. 1828. — ETYMOLOGY: ξηρός, dry; οὖς, ὠτός, ear. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): *Xerotus afer* Fr.—An excellent study of this species, based on the type specimen was made by Mrs. M. E. P. Kauffmann Fidalgo (*in* Mycologia **51**: 51 *fs. 1, 2.* 1959), who agreed with Singer (*in* Lilloa **22**: 205, 744. 1951; *apud* G. W. Martin & al. *in* Contr. Sci., Los Angeles Co. Mus. No. 24: 6. 1958) that it is polyporaceous, but not that it represents the genus currently called *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. After the study of a portion of the type and two collections which I refer to the genus I want to underline both conclusions. Because the name *Xerotes* (*Xerotus*) is preoccupied, the correct name for the type species is **Xerotinus afer** (Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.* (basinym, *Xerotus afer* Fr., Elench. **1**: 48. 1828). — SCOPE. In 1825 no species was mentioned by name ("Species ex Africa aequinoctiali"), but in 1828 the genus was redescribed and the name of its only species published. — REMARKS. As the genus was based on a single species (afterwards included by Fries, Epicr. 400. 1838, in section *Holoxerus*, marked "Typici"), one will be surprised to find that Clements & Shear (*1931:* 349) took *Xerotus romanus* Fr., a non-original species, as type of "*Xerotus* Fr. . . . 1825". — VARIANT SPELLING: *Xerotes* Fr., l.c. 1825.—This is the original spelling, but afterwards (starting from 1828, in a volume of the starting-point book) Fries always used the form *Xerotus* which is to be regarded as the standard spelling. — HOMONYM: *Xerotes* R. Br. (1810; Juncaceae). — ISONYM: *Xerotinus* Reichenb. (1828), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym, and, therefore, changed into *Xerotinus* Reichenb.

Xylodon (Pers.) per S. F. Gray.—'Hydnaceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **5**: 113. 1956).

Xylometron Paul.—See under *Agarico-carnis*.

Xylomycon.—See *Xylomyzon*.
Xylomyzon Pers.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 14. 1958).

Xylophagus Link per Murrill.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 14. 1958).

Xylopilus P. Karst. *in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: x, 69. 1882. — ETYMOLOGY: ξύλον, wood; πῖλος, cap. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species : *Polyporus crassus* Fr.—This is probably an abnormal condition of *Polyporus fomentarius* (L.) per Fr.; compare Fries (Hym. europ. 543. 1874): "Structura et color exacte *P. fomentarii*, ut hujus lusum maxime abnormen suspicior, licet saepius conformis sit lectus." — TYPONYMS. The following names are based on *Polyporus fomentarius*: *Agarico-igniarium* Paul. (1793; devalidated name), *Pyreium* Paul. (circa 1812; devalidated name), *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. (1849), *Placodes* (Quél. (1886), *Ungulina* Pat. ex Pat. (1900), and *Elfvingiella* Murrill (1914). — STATUS. Impriorable if considered a nomen monstrositatis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following titles have been cited by their dates printed in italics.

BONDARTSEV, A. S. (1953). Trutov'ie grib'i Evropeĭskoĭ chasti SSSR i Kavkaza. Moskva, Leningrad.

BONDARTSEV, A. S. & R. SINGER (1941). Zur Systematik der Polyporaceen. *In* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 43–65.

CLEMENTS, F. E. & C. L. SHEAR (1931). The genera of fungi. New York.

COOKE, W. B. (1940). A nomenclatorial survey of the genera of pore fungi. *In* Lloydia **3**: 81–104.

——— (1953). The genera of the Homobasidiomycetes (exclusive of the Gastromycetes). Special Publication issued by the Division of Mycology and Disease Survey, U.S. Dept. Agr., Beltsville, Md. — Mimeographed.

DONK, M. A. (1933). Revision der niederländischen Homobasidiomycetae-Aphyllophoraceae II. Proefschrift, Utrecht. Amsterdam, Haarlem. (Also issued as Meded. bot. Mus. Herb. Rijksuniv. Utrecht No. 9 and as Meded. Nederl. mycol. Ver. **22**).

IMAZEKI, R. (1943). [Genera of Polyporaceae of Nippon]. *In* Bull. Tokyo Sci. Mus. No. 6.

KOTLABA, F. & Z. POUZAR (1957). Poznámky k třídění evropských chorošů. Notes on classification of European pore fungi. *In* Česká Mykol. **11**: 152–170.

MURRILL, W. A. (1903). A historical review of the genera of the Polyporaceae. *In* J. Mycol. **9**: 87–102.

OVERHOLTS, L. O. (1953). The Polyporaceae of the United States, Alaska and Canada. Ann. Arbor.

SINGER, R. (1944). Notes on taxonomy and nomenclature of the polypores. *In* Mycologia **36**: 65–69.

INDEX

New names are in bold-face type. Subdivisions of genera are indicated by the sign §.

Abortiporus 175, 176, 205, 224, 231; subabortivus 206
Achersonia 188
Agarico-carnis 176, 178, 179, 262, 279; lingua bovis 178
Agarico-fungus 179, 205, 285; lamellis crassissimis rigidis 179
Agarico-igniarium 176, 178, 179, 207, 217, 259, 295; foliaceum 178; tegularium 178
Agaricon 176, 178, 180, 181, 232
Agarico-polyporus 178, 181, 232; albus, pulpa farinosa, subtus tubulosus fuscus 181
Agarico-pulpa 176, 178, 181, 232; juglandis 178; officinalis 178; ulmi 178; styptica 178
Agarico-suber 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 205, 285; daedaleum 178
Agarico-suillus 182, 191, 214; mollis ruberrimus 182
Agaricum 176, 178, 180-182, 197, 262, 265, 278, 285; purgans 178; stypticum 178
Agaricus 178, 180-182, 205, 212, 285; aureus 285; betulinus 194; campestris 180, 182; coriaceus 194, 204; daedalaeis sinibus excavatus 284; daedalaeis sinibus excavatus nigricans 284; de St. Clou 280; de St. Clou nigerrimus 279; hirsutus 220, 235, 279, 280; igniarius 254; involutus 211; ostreatus 197; quercinus 178, 182, 204, 285; sive Fungus Laricis 180; speciosus 232; suberosus 257
Albatrellus 182, 183, 194, 249; ovinus 183
Alveolinus 183
Amanita 182
Amauroderma 183-185, 234, 239
Amaurodermus 184, 233
Amphitretia 185, 245
Amylocystis 185
Amyloporia 185, 186; calcea 185; lenis 186
Amyloporis 186
Anastomaria 186
Anisomyces 186, 195, 196, 249
Antennaria 287
Anthrodia 187
Antrodia 186; epilobii 186; mollis 186; serpens 186
Aporpium 187
Artolenzites 187, 237
Aschersonia 187-189, 228, 231; basicystis 189
Ascobolus 287
Asterochaete 188
Aurantioporellus 189
Aurantioporus 189
Auricularia delicata 270
Baeostratoporus 189, 215
Baeostratosporus 189
Bizzozeriella 189; basicystis 189
Bjercardera 190
Bjerkandera 190, 247, 291
Boletopsis 190, 263; melaleuca 190
Boletus 181, 190, 191, 199, 228, 229, 232, 236, 245, 255, 261, 269, 275, 279; § Fistulina 214; § Milleporei 244; § Polyporus 263; § Poria 267-269; § Resupinatus 268; § Retiporei 277; aesculi-flavae 187; albidus 183, 193; badius 221; caesius 190; caudicinus 197; cinnabarinus 179; cinnamomeus 285; conchifer 273; contiguus 267; coriaceus 243; cristatus 221; cryptarum 267, 283; destructor 267; distortus 175; favus 210, 267; ferruginosus 219; flabelliformis 259; fomentarius 179; frondosus 221; fuligineus 183; giganteus 241; graveolens 220; hepaticus 214, 228; hydnoideus 260; igniarius 179, 190, 191, 245; lacteus 244; laricis 181; lateralis 221; leptocephalus 200; lucidus 221; medullapanis 266, 269; mori 224; nummularius 200, 243; perennis 200, 285; pileo Monachi 245; pini 270; platyporus 221; polyporus 243, 261; populinus 249; radula 257; ramosus 199, 200, 263; salicinus 267; sistotremoides 277; spongiosus 267; squamosus 263; 284; suberosus 257; supinus 217; tuberaster 261; ungulatus 218; unicolor 281; vernicosus 179; versicolor 190
Bondarzewia 191
Bornetina 206
Boudiera 191; connata 191; scalaria 191
Bresadolia 191, 197, 263; paradoxa 191
Buglossus 182, 191, 214, 229; quercinus 191
Bullardia 192
Bulliarda 192
Bulliardia 191, 197, 255; unicolor 192
Byssocorticium 247

Caloporia 192, 193; incarnata 192, 193; violacea 192, 193
Caloporus 183, 192, 193, 194, 237, 249; incarnatus 192
Campbellia 194
Cantharellus alveolaris 224
Cariolus 201
Cartilosoma 194
Cellularia 194, 201, 222, 235, 237; cyathiformis 194
Ceraporia 197

Ceraporus 197
Ceratophora 186, 195, 249; fribergensis 195; odorata 195
Ceratophorum 195
Ceriomyces 186, 191, 195-197, 249, 263; albus 196; crassus 195, 196; fischeri 196
Cerioporus 175, 196, 197, 238, 263, 290; hirta 197
Ceriporia 197
Cerrena 192, 197, 205, 255, 282
Cerrenella 197
Chaetoporellus 198, 278
Chaetoporus 198; tenuis 198
Choriphyllum 198, 199, 252, 277
Cladodendron 199, 221, 242, 260
Cladomeris 199, 221, 241, 242, 260
Cladoporus 199, 200, 232, 263, 264; fulvus 199, 200
Cladosporus 199, 200
Climacocystis 200
Climacodon 200
Coltricia 200, 251, 265, 292, 294; connata 200; perennis 200
Coltriciella 201
Coriolellus 201, 252
Coriolopsis 201
Coriolus 178, 190, 194, 201, 222; § Oxyporus 249; lutescens 201
Cryptoderma 201
Cryptoporus 201, 202; volvatus var. obvolutus 202
Cubamyces 202
Cyanosporus 202, 292
Cyclomyces 202, 203, 239; australis 203; fuscus 202, 203, 239; greenei 203; iodinus 203; turbinatus 203
Cyclomycetella 203
Cycloporellus 203
Cycloporus 203
Cyphella pendula 208, 271

Dacrymyces 181
Daedalea 178, 180, 182, 186, 204, 205, 262, 273, 274, 281, 285, 293; § Agaricinae 204; § Dimidiatae 204; § Genuinae 204; § Stipitatae 204; abietina 235; aesculi 187; ambigua 187; aurea 285; betulina 235; biennis 205, 223, 231; brasiliensis 212, 213; cinerea 204; confragosa 204, 205; coriacea 204; elegans 288; fusca 198-199; gibbosa 288; guyoniana 252; heteromorpha 235; maxima 204, 205; palisoti 204; philippinensis 206; pini 210, 288; quercina 178, 180, 182, 204, 205, 284, 293; ravenelii 197; rubescens 288; sprucei 252; suaveolens 288; trabea 252; unicolor 192, 197, 205, 228, 255, 281
Daedaleopsis 205; labyrinthiformis 205
Daedalia 205
Daedaloides 206; pinicola 206
Dedalaea 205
Dedalea 205
Dendrophagus 206, 287
Dendrosarcos 176, 178, 179; hepaticus 178, 179
Dendrosarcus 179
Diacanthodes 206
Dictyopanus 206; rhippidium 206; subpulverulentus 206
Dictyophanus 206
Dictyoporus 277

Earliella 206; cubensis 206
Echinodontium 207, 227; tinctorium 207, 227
Echinotrema 207; clanculare 207
Elfvingia 207, 217, 218; lipsiensis 207
Elfvingiella 178, 207, 259, 292, 295
Elmera 208
Elmeria 207, 208
Elmerina 208; berkeleyi 208; cladophora 208
Enslenia 208
Enslinia 208, 270, 271
Exagona 277
Exosporium 287

Fagi Fungus striliis usum praebens 285
Favaria 208
Favolaschia 208, 209, 270; auriscalpium 209; cinnabarina 209; gaillardi 209; rubra 209; saccharina 209
Favolosus 211
Favolus 197, 210-214, 225, 226, 232, 255; alveolaris 224; alveolarius 211, 224; brasiliensis 212-214; daedaleus 211, 213; europaeus 214, 224; glaber 210; extratropicus 211, 224; intestinalis 270; hirtus 210-212, 224, 225, 278; mori 211, 224; princeps 188; reticulatus 211; tenuiculus 210-212; tenuis 211
Fibuloporia 214
Fistularia 214
Fistulina 182, 191, 199, 214, 228, 262; buglossiodes 214, 228; hepatica 178, 179, 181, 191, 214, 265
Fistulinia 214
Flabellaria 199, 214, 215, 221, 242, 260
Flabellopilus 215, 241
Flaviporellus 215
Flaviporus 215; **brownei** 189, 215
Fomes 178, 207, 215-218, 232, 233, 247, 259, 269, 275, 279, 291, 292, 295; connatus 191; corrugis 250; ellisianus 269; fomentarius 207, 291; fraxinophilus 269; juniperinus 269; lucidus 216; melanoporus 247; musashiensis 276; ohiensis 290; pachyphloeus 250; regulicolor 183; rhinocerotis 238; rhippidium

206; ribis 201; robiniae 218; robustus 217; salicinus 215; tenuis 198; tinctorius 207; trivialis 275; ungulatus 218; warburgianus 293
Fomitella 217
Fomitiporella 217, 219
Fomitiporia 217; langloisii 217
Fomitopsis 216, 217, 276
Friesea 218
Friesia 218; rubra 218
Fulvifomes 218
Funalia 218
Fungoides 176, 177, 219; hyosotis 219
Fungus 179, 182
Fuscoporella 217, 219; coruscans 219
Fuscoporia 219

Ganoderma 183, 219, 221, 234, 253, 291; § Amauroderma 183, 184, 234; § Ganoderma 184; § Trachyderma 287; auriscalpium 184; colossus 287; exile 184; flabelliforme 219; macer 184; neglectum 184; omphalodes 184; praetervisum 184; rufobadium 184; rugosum 184; subrugosum 184; tsunodae 287; umbraculum 184
Glæoporus 220
Gleophyllum 220, 280, 281
Globifomes 220
Gloeophyllum 220, 235-237, 294
Gloeoporus 220, 272; conchoides 220; pusillus 206
Gloeothele 220
Gloiothele 220
Grammothele 221; grisea 271; lineata 221
Grifola 199, 221, 242, 260; platypora 221
Gyrophana 280

Hansenia 194, 201, 221, 222
Hapalopilus 222, 252
Haplopilus 222
Haploporus 222
Helvella conformis 245
Hemidiscia 223, 274; lactea 223
Henningsia 223; geminella 223
Henningsomyces 223
Heterobasidion 223
Heterobasidium 223
Heteroporus 176, 205, 223-226, 231
Hexagona (Hexagonia) 210, 211, 224, 225, 278; § H. hirtae 226; aculeata 226; alveolaris 224; apiaria 278; apiaris 225; cladophora 207, 208; crinigera 224-226; decipiens 253; flabelliformis 207, 208; marcucciana 224; miquelii 275; mori 210, 224-226; nitida 224, 226; nitida f. trametoidea 252; setigera 226; wightii 225; wrightii 225
Hirneola auricula-judae 180
Hirschioporus 227
Hirshioporus 227
Hologloea 227, 272; micropora 227; pezizaeformis 227
Hydnochaete 227
Hydnofomes 207, 227; tsugicola 227
Hydnophysa 207, 227
Hydnoporia 227
Hydnotrema 228, 281, 282
Hydnum 227, 228, 281; occarium 283; olivaceum 228; orbiculatum 283; pectinatum 283; sublamellosum 281, 282; tinctorium 207
Hydroporia 228
Hymenogramma 228
Hymenogramme 188, 228, 232; javensis 228, 232
Hypodrys 182, 191, 199, 214, 228, 229
Hypolepia 229

Inoderma 229, 230, 241
Inodermus 229, 241; § Spongiosi 229; § Stupposi 229
Inonotus 230, 253, 257, 264, 294
Irpex 230; fuscoviolaceus 251; lamellosus 283; mollis 230; pachyodon 230; tabacinus 197
Irpiciporus 230
Irpicium 176, 224, 231; ulmicola 231
Irpicochaete 231
Ischnoderma 231; rubiginosum 231
Ischoderma 231

Junghuhnia 188, 228, 231, 232
Junguhnia 231

Kneiffia grisea 271
Kordera 231

Laccocephalum 231; basilapidodes 232; basilapiloides 232
Laetiporus 200, 232, 264
Lamyxis 232, 282
Laricifomes 178, 181, 232
Laschia 187, 188, 208, 209, 227, 228, 232; § Auriculariella 209; § Eulaschia 209; § Favolaschia 209; § Porolaschia 271, 272; auriscalpium 209; cinnabarina 209; clypeata 271; 272; crustacea, 187, 228, 231, 232; gaillardi 209; guaranitica 271; intestinalis 270; papulata 271; pezizaeformis 271; pezizoidea 209, 272; spathulata 232; sprucei 271, 272
Lentinus 212
Lentus 184, 233, 234, 238, 239, 249, 251, 260, 261, 284
Lenzites 178, 187, 194, 204, 235, 237; abietinus 277; applanata 187; betulina 194; palisoti 187; repanda 187; sepiaria 220, 235, 279, 280
Lenzitina 220, 235, 280, 281

Leptopora 236, 237; difformis 236; nivea 236; stercoria 236
Leptoporus 193, 236, 237, 274, 291; chioneus 290; erubescens 193, 236; mollis 193, 236, rufoflavus 215
Leptostroma 236
Leucofomes 237, 241
Leucolenzites 187, 194, 235, 237
Leucophellinus 237
Leucoporus 235, 238, 261; § Asterochaete 188; § Gelatinosi 272; arcularius 238; brumalis 238; ciliatus 238
Leueophellinus 238
Leuzites 235
Licentia 238
Lignosus 233, 234, 238, 239
Lindnera 239
Lindtneria 239
Lopharia 239
Loxophyllum 202, 203, 239; velutinum 202, 239

Melanoporella 239
Melanoporia 239
Melanopus 197, 200, 238, 240; caudicinus 240; elegans 240; nummularius 240; picipes 240; squamosus 240; varius 240; varius subsp. nummularius 251
Mensularia 229, 230, 240
Meripilus 215, 241
Merisma 199, 215, 234, 241, 242, 260
Merismus 233, 234, 242
Merulioporia 193, 242
Meruliporia 243
Merulius 204, 229, 242, 280-281; alveolaris 211, 212, 224; daedaleus 212, 213; fugax 245; lacrymans 280; ravenelii 193
Microcarpus 244
Microporellus 243
Microporus 243, 244; concinnus 243, 244; perula 243, 244
Micropus 244
Milleporus 244
Mison 191, 245, 279
Monka 245
Mucilago 245, 246; reticulata 245
Muciporus 246
Mucronoporus 217, 246, 249; andersonii 294
Multiporus 246; chlamydoformans 247
Mycobonia 247
Mycodendrom 247
Mycodendron 247
Mycodentrum 247
Myriadoporus 190, 247; adustus 247
Myson 245

Nigrofomes 247
Nigroporus 247
Nothotrechispora 247

Ochroporus 191, 217, 247, 254; § Apodoporinus 248; § Polystictus 248; § Poria 248; confusus 267
Odontia 255
Oglioporus 248
Oligoporus 248; farinosus 248; rubescens 248; ustilaginoides 248
Onnia 248, 249
Osmoporus 186, 195, 196, 249
Ovinus 183, 233, 235, 249
Oxyporus 191, 149
Oxyuria 250
Oxyuris 249, 250

Panus 206; berkeleyi 207; coriaceus 207
Parodiscus porodisculus 271
Pelloporus 203, 234, 250, 251, 265, 292, 294; perennis 251; triqueter 250; triqueter var. corrugis 250
Perenniporia 251
Persooniana 251; albocana 251
Petaloides 233, 234, 251, 260
Peziza 219; pendula 270, 271
Phaeocoriolellus 252
Phaeocyphella 253
Phaeodaedalea 252
Phaeolopsis 252
Phaeolus 205, 252, 277, 284
Phaeoporus 230, 252, 253, 264; § Apodoporella 253; § Phaeoporella 253; § Pleuropodella 253; obliquus 253
Phaeoradulum 253
Phaeotrametes 253
Phelline 254
Phellinus 190, 191, 217, 237, 245, 253, 254, 259, 269, 275, 276, 293; conchatus 267; ferruginosus 266; igniarius subsp. nigricans 275; salicinus 293
Phelloporus 251
Pherima 255
Phisisporinus 256
Phlebiella 247
Phomes 217
Phorima 254, 255; betulina 254; 255; boletoides 255; difformis 255; minuta 255
Phorina 254
Phyllodontia 192, 197, 255, 282; magnusii 255
Phylloporia 256; parasitica 256
Physisporinus 256; incarnatus 193; vitreus 256
Physisporus 186, 193, 256, 257, 270; aurantiacus var. saloisensis (taloisensis) 278; medulla-panis 256; radula 257; tener 198; tenuis 198
Physoporus 257
Physosporus 257
Picnoporus 276
Piptoporus 257. 259, 291

Placoderma 257-259, 291; betulinum 258
Placodes 178, 217, 258, 259, 295; § Fomentarii 259; § Placoderma 258, 259
Podoporia 256, 259, 278; confluens 259; sanguinolenta 260
Pogonomyces 260
Poliporus 263
Polyphorus 263
Polypilus 199, 221, 241, 242, 260
Polyplocium 260
Polyporellus 235, 238, 250; alveolaris 224; alveolarius 224; varius 251
Polyporoletus 261; sublividus 261
Polyporus 175, 176, 181, 184, 197, 199, 200, 205, 211-213, 216, 221, 228, 230, 232, 235, 239, 241, 244, 245, 249, 261-264, 270, 272, 273, 281, 290, 292; § Apus 277; § Biennis 250; § Carnosi (trib. Apus) 236; § Carnosi (trib. Merisma) 242; § Carnosi (trib. Mesopus) 193, 194, 249; § Caseosi 242, 291; § Cladoporus 200; § Coriacei 201, 264; § Crytoporus 202; § P. dichroi 190; § Favolus 210, 211-213; § Favoloidei 210-211, 213; § Flabellaria 214; § Fomes 215, 216; § Fomentarii 216, 218; § P. frondosi 242; § P. hispidi 230; § Hornotini 234, 238; § P. imbricati 242; § Inodermei 229; § Lenti (trib. Apus) 190; § Lenti (trib. Merisma) 242; § Lenti (trib. Mesopus) 223, 238; § Lenti (trib. Pleuropus) 196, 238, 240; § P. lenti 233, 234, 260; § P. lobati 242; § Melanopodes 234, 240; § P. melanopodis 196, 197, 234, 240, 260; § Merisma 199, 214, 215, 234, 241; § Mesopodes 262; § Mesopus 245, 262, 263; § Milleporus 245; § P. mollis 236; § Ovini 234, 249; § P. ovini 194, 234, 249; § Ovinus 249; § Petaloides 234, 251; § P. petaloidis 234, 251, 260; § Phaeolus 252; § Placodermei 258, 259; § Polysticta 264, 265; § Polysticti 283; Poria 268; § Resupinatus 256, 268; § Retiporus 277; § Scenidium 278; § Spongiosa 234, 283; § Spongiosi (trib. Apus) 229, 230; Spongiosi (stalked) 234, 283; § Stuposi 229; § Stupposi 229; § Subcoriacei 250, 283; § Suberosi (trib. Apus) 231, 258; § Suberosi (trib. Merisma) 242; abietinus 227; adustus 190; albidus 290; albobrunneus 236; albolutescens 289; alboluteus 189; alveolaris 224; alveolarius 214, 224; amorphus 190, 220, 282; annosus 223, 292; apiarius 225, 226; applanatus 207, 218; arcularius 214, 263; auriscalpium 184; badius 247; benzoinus 231, 288; betulinus 257, 258, 291, 292; biennis 176, 250, 283, 284; borealis 236; boucheanus 197; brasiliensis 223; braunii 189, 215; brownei 189; brumalis 233, 238, 260, 263; caesius 202; calceus 185; carbonaceus 239; carbonarius 262; caudicinus 263; chioneus 237, 290, 291; circinatus 246, 248; colossus 206, 287; conchatus 253, 293; conchifer 273; conchoides 220; confluens 241; connatus 191, 249; contiguus 247, 248; corrugatus 207; corrugis 238, 250; corticola 244, 264; crassus 295; cristatus 241; croceus 189; cubensis 202; cuticularis 230, 253, 264, 293; dealbatus 238, 243; deceptivus 253; dependens 201; destructor 273; dichrous 190; discipes 264; distortus 175, 176; dryadeus 258, 293; elegans 221; epileucus 237; erubescens 258; esculentus . . . 261; euporus 198; fascietus 262; ferruginosus 219, 268; fibrillosus 275; fomentarius 178, 179, 215-217, 258, 259, 275, 291, 292, 295; frondosus 199, 215, 241, 242, 260, 262; fuligineus 183; fuliginosus 231, 292; fulvus 253, 254; fumosus 190; funalis 218, 264; fuscobadius 207; gallicus 288; giganteus 215, 241; gilvus 246; glomeratus 294; graveolens 220; haematodes 193; helveolus 258; heteroclitus 274; hirtus 197, 211, 212, 225, 226; hispidus 229, 230, 253, 293; hydnoides 260; hymenocystis 289; hypococcineus 230; igniarius 180, 217, 245, 247, 248, 253, 254, 276, 278; imberbis 242, 274; imbricatus 241, 242; incarnatus 192, 193; javanicus 252; laciniatus 278; lacteus 223, 273, 274; lapponicus 185; lentus 233; leoninus 218; lepideus 238; lepricurii 271; leprieurii 271; leptocephalus 261; leucomelas 190; leucospongia 284; licnoides 246; lucidus 216, 219, 253, 259; luteonitidus 252; lutescens 201; macounii 219; marginatus 216-218, 292; medulla-panis 256, 257, 266; megaloporus 188; melanoporus 247; melanopus 219, 238, 240, 260; michelii 197, 266; micromegas 277; mollis 236; mons-veberis 219; monsveneris 218, 219; montagnei 203; montanus 191; mori 224; multiconcha 262; nidulans 222; niger 239; nigricans 275; obducens 249; obliquus 253, 256, 257; occidentalis 201; ochroleucus 290-292; odoratus 195; officinalis 178, 180, 181, 216, 232, 258; ovinus 183, 193, 194, 249; pallescens 256, 290, 291; pannocinctus 260; parvulus 265; pavonius 203; pectinatus 253; pendulus 208, 271; perennis 200, 243, 250, 262-265, 283, 285, 293; peronatus 292; persoonii 207; pes-caprae 179, 183, 279; petalo(i)des 251, 260 pilotae 189; pini 270, 293; pinicola 218; pocula 271; populinus 249; prolificans 264; quercinus 258; radiatus 229, 241,

293; radicatus 241; radula 257; ramosus 200; resinosus 231, 258; reticulatus 245, 264; rheades 293; rhipidium 206; rimosus 293; rubriporus 253, 254, 276; rufescens 283, 284; rufoflavens 215; rufoflavus 189, 215; russiceps 188; sacer 238, 239, 243, 264; salicinus 215, 253, 256, 267; salignus 274; sanguineus 179; sanguinolentus 259, 278; scabrosus 207; schomburgkii 183, 184; schweinitzii 199, 204, 252, 277, 283, 284; scropulosus 293; scutiger 225; semipileatus 290; semisupinus 256; sendaiensis 276; senex 293; splitgerberi 215; spumeus 284; squamosus 175, 178, 193, 194, 196, 210, 212, 221, 240, 261, 263, 268; stipticus 290; suaveolens 288; subsquamosus 262; sulphureus 178, 199, 200, 232, 241, 263; superpositus 238; supinus 217; surinamensis 277; tephroleucus 287; tessulatus 263; tomentosus 246, 248, 250, 265, 283, 293; torulosus 178, 253, 276; trabeus 274; trichomallus 218, 290; triqueter 250; trogii 250; tubarius 238; tuberaster 175, 195-197, 244, 245, 261-263, 290; ulmarius 237, 241; ulmi 262, 263; umbellatus 199; umbilicatus 262; unicolor 230; unitus 266; vallatus 252; vaporarius 267; varius 219, 221; vegetus 253; veraecrucis 252; versicolor 194, 201, 264, 265; vespaceus 208; vibecinus 232; vinosus 247; violaceus 192; vitreus 256; volvatus 202; vulgaris 267, 268; vulgaris var. calceus 185; weinmannii 274; wightii 224, 225, 278; wrightii 224; xanthopus 243; xoilopus 250; zonalis 277; zonatus 201

Polystichoides 264

Polysticta 264, 269; reticulata 264

Polystictoides 230, 253, 264

Polystictus 201, 233, 243, 244, 251, 264, 265, 273, 285, 292, 294; § Coriacei 264; § P. funalis 218; § Pelloporus 250; § Perennes 250, 251; § P. perennis 250, 264, 264; § Placoderma 258, 264; § P. sacri 234, 238; § P. scortei 222; § P. stuposi 229; § P. versicoloris 201, 222; hirsutus 222; perennis 292; petaliformis 223; rigescens 223; scorteus 222; versicolor 221, 222

Poria 199, 254, 256, 257, 259, 265-270, 289, 294; § Chrooporae 197; § Porogramme 271; § Subtiles 289; albocincta 287; albolutescens 289; aurantiaca 278; borbonica 287; calcea 185, 186; candidissima 289; contigua 268; corticola 198, 244; crustacea 232; destruens 267; dussii 271; eupora 198; ferruginosa 268; fimbriata 266; fuligo var. aurantiotingens 287; laciniata 278; lamellosa 220; latitans 198; lenis 185, 186; medullapanis 251, 256, 257, 266-269; medullaris 266, 267, 270; mollusca 214; nigra 239; obliqua 268; onusta 289; pannocincta 260; punctata 217; rixosa 268; salicina 266, 268; setulosa 208, 220; subincarnata 269; taxicola 193; trachyspora 239, 290; umbrinella 219; vaporaria 267; versipora 198, 278; viridans 197; vitrea 256; vulgaris 267-269; weirii 250

Porium 265, 270

Poroauricula 270

Porodaedalea 206, 270

Porodisculus 208, 270, 271

Porodiscus 208, 270, 271

Porogramme 271; dussii 271; grisea 271; lateritia 271

Porolaschia 271, 272; manupularis 272; micropora 227, 272; nummularia 272; sprucei 272; tonkinensis 272

Poronidulus 273

Poroptyche 273; candida 273

Porostereum 273

Porotheleum 273; fimbriatum 266

Porothelium 273

Porphyrellus 261

Postia 223, 273; borealis 273, 274; caesia 274; lactea 274; mollis 274; trabea 274 weinmanni 274

Protodaedalea 274; hispida 274

Pseudofavolus 275; cucullatus Mont. 275; miquelii Mont. 275; pustulatus 275

Pseudofomes 191, 245, 275, 279; nigricans 275

Pseudopelloporus 224

Pseudotrametes 275

Ptychogaster 196; albus 196; citrinus 248

Pycnoporellus 275

Pycnoporus 179, 275, 276

Pyreium 176, 178, 179, 207, 217, 259 292, 295; fomentarium 178; giganteum 179; igniarium 178

Pyropolyporus 217, 254, 276; robiniae 218

Pyrrhoderma 276

Racodium 179

Reisneria 277; papyracea 277

Retiporus 277

Rigidoporus 277

Rodwaya 277

Romellia 252, 277, 284

Rommellia 277

Sacsia 281

Saesia 281

Sarcoporia 277; polyspora 277

Scalaria 278; fusca 278

Scenidium 226, 278

Schizophyllum commune 180

Schizopora 278; laciniata 278

Scindalma 191, 245, 248, 275, 278, 279; laminis tenuioribus 278
Sclerodepsis 279; berkeleyi 279
Scutiger 176, 179, 183, 221, 263, 279; tuberosus 179, 279
Serda 220, 236, 279-281
Serpula 280
Sesia 220, 236, 280; byssina 280
Sisotrema 232, 282; globularis 232
Sistotrema 175, 192, 197, 228, 255, 281, 282; § Heteroporus 224; bienne 282; cinereum 197, 228, 281; confluens 281, 282; fuscescens 227; olivaceum 227; quercinum 282; rufescens 282; sulphureum 286
Sistrema 282
Sistrotonema 281
Skeletocutis 282
Solenia 282
Somion 282
Spathulina 283
Sphaeria pocula 208, 271
Spongioides 283
Spongiosus 199, 234, 252, 277, 283; rufescens 283; schweinitzii 283
Spongipellis 284; spumeus 284
Spongiporus 284
Stereofomes 284
Stigmatolemma 284
Stilbospora 287
Stipitate Polyporoids § Amaurodermus 184, 234; § Fomes 234; § Ganodermus 234; § Lentus 233, 234; § Lignosus 234; § Melanopus 234; § Merismus 234; § Petaloides 234, 251; § Spongiosus 234, 283
Striglia 180, 205, 265, 284, 285
Strilia 284, 285
Stromatoscypha fimbriatum 267
Suillus 181, 183, 199
Sulphurina 286
Systoma 282
Systotrema 281, 282

Tädalea 205
Thelephora 181
Thelepora 229, 286
Theleporus 286; cretaceus 286
Theloporus 286
Thwaitesiella 286
Thwaitsiella 286
Tilotus 287
Tinctoporia 287; aurantiotingens 287
Tomentifolium 287
Tomophagus 287
Tortula 287; tortuosa 287
Trachyderma 287
Trachyspora 289
Trametella 288
Trametes 186, 204, 216, 273, 275, 276, 288; § Placoderma 258; § Resupinati 186, 187; actinopila 279; benzoina 288; cinnabarina 276; colliculosa 279; corrugata 206; 207; cubensis 202; gallica 210; gibbosa 275; hispida 210, 288; isabellina 187; irpicoides 237; ljubarskyi 222; mollis 186, 187; odora 222; odorata 186, 195, 196, 249; ohiensis 290; pini 206, 210; sclerodepsis 279; sepium 201; serialis 276; serpens 186, 187; subsinuosa 194
Trechispora 247, 288, 289; onusta 281, 288, 289
Trechisporia 289
Tremella 181
Trichamptum 290
Trichaptum 290
Truncospora 270
Tuberaster 195, 197, 263
Tubulina 214
Tulasnella 274
Tylotus 290
Tyromyces 251, 273, 274, 290; chioneus 274; mollis 236; pallescens 274

Underwoodina 188, 189
Ungularia 257, 259, 291; tuberosa 291
Ungulina 178, 207, 216, 217, 259, 291, 292, 295; § Fomentarius 292; § Fomitopsis 292; § Piptoporus 292

Verpa 245; patula 245
Volvopolyporus 210, 251, 265, 292, 294
Vonckhout 293
Vonkhout 179, 293

Whitfordia 293

Xanthochrous 201, 203, 251, 257, 265, 293; § Conchati 293; § Cycloporus 203; § Hispidi 293; § Perennes 250, 265, 293
Xanthoporia 294
Xerotes 294
Xerotinus 294; **afer** 294
Xerotus 174, 294; § Holoxerus 294; afer 294; romanus 294
Xylodon 295
Xylometron 176, 179, 276; lobatum 179; sanguineum 179; spinosum 179
Xylomycon 295
Xylomyzon 295
Xylophagus 295
Xylopilus 178, 207, 217, 259, 292, 295
Xylostroma giganteum 179

PERSOONIA
Published by the Rijksherbarium, Leiden
Volume 2, Part 2, pp. 201–210 (1962)

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR POLYPORACEAE
Additions and corrections

M. A. Donk
Rijksherbarium, Leiden

This paper contains some additional information and discussions as well as corrections of statements and of facts recorded in a previously published paper entitled "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae".

Introduction.—This paper forms part of a series entitled "The generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes" and contains additions and corrections related to "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae" (Donk *in* Persoonia **1**: 173–302. 1960) which represents the tenth part of the series.[1]

Shortly after the publication of "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae" another paper appeared that to a large extent covered the same field: W. B. Cooke, "The genera of pore fungi" (*in* Lloydia **22**: 163–207. "1959" [June 30, 1960]). The reader who compares the two publications as to details will find many discrepancies, but he also will soon find that most of them were repetitions from Cooke's previous publications and that I already dealt with them in my above mentioned paper, so that there is no need to return to these. Other discrepancies will be indicated below. I have also added cross-references to those generic names that Cooke mentioned but that I left out altogether because the names are actually based on species not referable to the 'Polyporaceae'.

Ad *Agarico-carnis* Paul. — When I discussed Paulet's mycological publications in connection with this and several other names he coined, I forgot to take into account a publication by that author which appeared at an earlier date than his "Traité des Champignons" (1793) and which is entitled, "Tabula plantarum fungosarum", Parisiis, 31 pp. with 1 table. 1791. In this paper Paulet established the genera he was to use in the "Index" of the "Traité des Champignons" and which

[1] This is Part XIV of the series. The parts already published or in press are as follows: Part I ("Cyphellaceae") *in* Reinwardtia **1**: 199–220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes) *in* Reinwardtia **2**: 435–440. 1954; Part III ("Clavariaceae") *in* Reinwardtia **2**: 441–493. 1954; Part IV (Boletaceae) *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 275–313. 1955; Part V ("Hydnaceae") *in* Taxon **5**: 69–80, 95–115. 1956; Part VI (Brachybasidiaceae, Cryptobasidiaceae, Exobasidiaceae) *in* Reinwardtia **4**: 113–118. 1956; Part VII ("Thelephoraceae") *in* Taxon **6**: 17–28, 68–85, 106–123. 1957; Part VIII (Auriculariaceae, Septobasidiaceae, Tremellaceae, Dacrymycetaceae) *in* Taxon **7**: 164–178, 193–207, 236–250. 1958; Part IX ("Meruliaceae" and *Cantharellus* s. str.) *in* Fungus **28**: 7–15. 1958; [Part X] "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae" *in* Persoonia **1**: 173–302. 1960; [Part XI] "The generic names proposed for Agaricaceae", in press; Part XII (Deuteromycetes), in press; Part XIII (Additions and corrections to Parts I–IX), in press.

registered the scientific names of the genera and species he described under French names in the preceding text. All generic names were accompanied by descriptions (in Latin).

The following corrections in the places of publications are to be made.

Agarico-carnis Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 11. 1791 (devalidated name).

Agarico-igniarium Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 10. 1791 (devalidated name).

Agarico-pulpa Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 12. 1791 (devalidated name).

Agarico-suber Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 9. 1791 (devalidated name).

Apus (C. Nees) ex S. F. Gray.—'Agaricaceae' (see Part XI, in press).

Ad *Agaricon* [Tourn.] Adans. — The remark (p. 181), "I have not come across a valid publication of *Agaricus* Tourn. after the starting-point date (1821) of these fungi", is to be crossed out and the following changes to be made.

Agaricus [Tourn.] Rafin., Medic. Fl. N. Amer. **2**: 186. 1830. — VALID PUBLICATION. This is Rafinesque's account in which he took up this early name in its original (Tournefortian) sense:

"AGARICUS. *Punk.* Many species, growing on decayed trees. All more or less styptic and bitter, useful to make the Agaric, a soft powder . . .. Punk is the Indian name for all perennial fungi growing on trees and of a spongy nature: useful to make spunk or touch wood . . .."—Rafinesque (op. cit. pp. 186–187).

Although there is no reference to De Tournefort's work, it is clear that Rafinesque had *Agaricus* Tourn. in mind and not *Agaricus* L., which he called "*Amanita* Lam." The above quoted account contains just sufficient descriptive matter to ensure valid publication of the name.

It should be pointed out that Rafinesque in the same work also accepted a restricted genus *Boletus* L. the differences of which with *Agaricus* Rafin. are not well stated:

"BOLETUS, L. *Touchwood.* Fungi with pores beneath; we have nearly 200 species: those with cells beneath are my G. *Phorima* [cf. Donk *in* Persoonia **1**: 254. 1960]; *Polyporus* has a central stem, *Dedalea* [!] a labyrinth beneath, *Fistulina* hollow tubes beneath. The true *Boletus* are sessile, equivalent to *Agaricus* to make tinder and styptic lint. *A. cinnabarinus* dies red. *B. suberosus* . . . *B. igniarius* and *B. fomentarius* . . . *B. marginatus. B. odoratus* and *B. suaveolens* . . . The *B. laricis* . . .."—Rafinesque (op. cit. p. 201).

STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym *Agaricus* L. per Fr. (1821).

Asterostromella Höhn. & L.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 20. 1957 & Part XIII, in press).

Ad *Boletus* S. F. Gray. — The name *Boletus* L. was also used in a strongly emended and reduced sense by Rafinesque (Medic. Fl. N. Amer. 201. 1830). His use of the name may be considered a mere monadelphous homonym of *Boletus* S. F. Gray with which it would seem roughly to agree. For an excerpt from Rafinesque's account on his genus, see above under *Agaricus* [Tourn.] Rafin.

Ad *Boudiera* Lázaro. — W. B. Cooke (*in* Lloydia **22**: 174. 1960) and Donk (*in* Persoonia **1**: 191. 1960) list the same type, which Cooke cites as "*B. connata* (Batr.)" and Donk as "*Polyporus connatus* Weinm., not *Polyporus connatus* Schw." The latter author remarked further, "If Lázaro correctly interpreted *Polyporus connatus* = *P. populinus* Fr. (of which I am not yet sure), then *Oxyporus* (Bourd. & G.) Donk . . . is a typonym". Cooke's conclusion in this regard is widely at variance since he states that *Boudiera* Lázaro is, "Possibly a synonym of *Coltricia* S. F. Gray." I would conclude that he confused Lázaro's type species with the completely unrelated *Coltricia connata* S. F. Gray ≡ *Boletus perennis* L. ≡ *Polyporus perennis* L. per Fr.

Byssocorticium Bond. & Sing. ex Sing.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 23. 1957).

Caloporia P. Karst. and
Caloporus P. Karst.—See "Additions and corrections to Parts I–IX" ('Meruliaceae').

Cristella Pat.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 68. 1957).

Ad *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. — As stated, Quélet (1876) remarked that he considered *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr. a species of *Lenzites* Fr., but he was not the first actually to make the combination *L. quercina:* this was done before 1886 by Karsten [*in* Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk **37**: 54. 1882 ("Quél.")].

Ad *Daedaloides* Lázaro. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Daedaleoides*"; W. B. Cooke *in* Lloydia **22**: 179. 1959.

Ad *Echinodontium* Ell. & Ev. *in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **27** : 49. Feb. 1900 (corrected reference). — Add under 'TYPONYMS': See also under *Hydnophysa* P. Henn., additional remark inserted below. – The genus was recently excluded from the Polyporaceae and made the type genus of a new family, Echinodontiaceae Donk (*in* Persoonia **1**: 405. 1961).

Ad *Elmeria* Bres. & *Elmerina* Bres. — Originally W. B. Cooke listed *Poria setulosa* P. Henn. as type species of both *Elmeria* and *Elmerina*. More recently (W. B. Cooke *in* Lloydia **22**: 180. 1960) he partly returned on this and gave *Polyporus vespaceus* Pers. as type species of *Elmeria*, but retained *Poria setulosa* for *Elmerina*. By his remark under *Elmerina*, "Neither species cited with *Elmeria* is mentioned except by implication", one is forced to conclude that he considered *Poria setulosa* the only original species of the generic name, because it was the only species Bresadola dealt with separately when introducing *Elmerina*. In fact, he makes it quite clear that he regards *Elmeria* Bres. (1912, not 1911 as Cooke states) and *Elmerina* Bres. as two distinct genera, the first "being a segregate of *Hexagona*, the other of *Poria*". In addition, he does not consider *Elmeria* Bres. a homonym (orthographic variant) of *Elmera* Rydb. (1905; Saxifragaceae) and hence emphasizes that *Elmeria* Bres. is "valid and usable".

As to the typification of *Elmeria* Bres., *Polyporus vespaceus* ("the better known" of the two original species) should not be accepted as long as the inadequacy of the earlier choice, *Hexagona cladophora* Berk., has not been demonstrated.

Cooke's surprising conclusion that we are dealing in this case with two different genera can be easily unnerved: *Elmerina* owes its valid publication to a reference to the earlier published *Elmeria* Bres. (there is no accompanying generic description) and hence is a pure isonym of that name, and its original species as well as its type completely coincide with those of the basionym. If one would interpret *Elmerina* as a new monotypic genus it would not be validly published because there were no accompanying descriptions, not even a descriptio generico-specifica, and because its only species (*Poria setulosa*) was not a new one.

If one wants to go so far as to accept *Elmera* Rydb. and *Elmeria* Bres. as non-homonymous names, then it should be remembered that Bresadola's name is impriorable (illegitimate) on account of *Elmeria* Ridl. (1909; Zingiberaceae).

Ad *Favolaschia* (Pat.) Pat. apud Pat. & Lagerh. — W. B. Cooke (*in* Lloydia **22**: 181. 1960) admits two genera *Favolaschia*, one of which is "*Favolaschia* Pat. in Morat [!] Journ. Bot. 1887: 231. 1887". The correct citation of this name is '*Laschia* sect. *Favolaschia* Pat. *in* J. Bot. (ed. Morot), Paris **1**: 231. 1887'. Why it should be typified by *Laschia auriscalpium* Mont. is not clear to me.

Ad *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. — I have been unable to verify W. B. Cooke's statement that "Cunningham has chosen *Fomes salicinus* (Fr.) Kickx as the type of the genus *Fomes* Kickx". As previously indicated, I am aware that Cunningham chose *Polyporus igniarius*, and in addition I may point out that he (Cunningham *in* Trans. roy. Soc. New Zeal. **82**: 895. 1955) even remarked: "*F. salicinus* and *F. igniarius* . . . as the former has not been proposed as a type it may be disregarded further".

Cooke also stated that he had previously chosen *Fomes igniarius* as type of *Fomes* Kickx. I have been unable to verify this; in any case he wrote on previous occasions that "*Fomes* Kickx" was "Based on *Boletus fomentarius* L."

Ad *Fomitiporia* Murrill. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Formitiporia*"; W. B. Cooke *in* Lloydia **22**: 182. 1960.—Evidently a misprint.

Ad *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. — The authors' citation of the generic name should read '(P. Karst.) P. Karst.'

Add: BASIONYM: *Lenzites* subgen. *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. *in* Acta Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. **2** (1): 15. 1881.—Introduced in a paper entitled "Hymenomycetes fennici" with three species in this order: *Lenzites sepiaria* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr., *L. abietinus* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr., and *L. septentrionalis* P. Karst. — HOMONYM: *Gloeophyllum* Korsikov (1953; Protococcineae, Chlorophyta; lacking Latin description).

Gyrophana Pat.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 9. 1958).

Gyrophora Pat.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 10. 1958).

Ad *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. — Replace the given account by the two following.

Haploporus Bond. & Sing. *ex* Sing. *in* Mycologia **36**: 66, 68. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: ἁπλόος simple; πόρος pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Trametes odora* (Sommerf.: Fr. Fr. sensu Nikol. and Bond. & Sing.—According to Bondartsev (Trutov. Griby 300. 1953) this is *Fomitopsis odoratissima* Bond. — PROTONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. *in* Ann. mycol., Berl. **39**: 60. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. Two species were mentioned thus: "Typ: *H. odorus* (Fr.) B.-S. Ferner: *H. Ljubarskyi* (Pil.) B.-S." — REMARK. When Singer l.c. validly published the generic name he indicated as its type: "*H. odorus* (Fr.) B.-S.", the same species given as type when the protonym was published. When Bondartsev see below validly published the name at a later date (without reference to Singer's publication he appointed the other one of the two original species, viz. *Trametes ljubarskyi* Pilát, in this way creating a later homonym. — HOMONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. 1953 ('Polyporaceae').

Haploporus Bond., Trutov. Griby 47, 523. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ἁπλόος, simple; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Trametes ljubarskyi* Pilát. — REMARKS. See also under preceeding name. — When Bondartsev, independently of Singer's valid publication of *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing., took up the latter name ("g.n."), he excluded the type (indicated when the latter was published and which had also been indicated by Singer) under the name *Fomitopsis odoratissima* Bond. and proceeded to appoint as type the other one of the two originally included species *Trametes ljubarskyi*, thus creating a later homonym. This generic name should be known as *Haploporus* 'Bond.' rather than as 'Bond. & Sing. ex Bond.' The supposition that Bondartsev had identified the two original species appeared quite erroneously Donk *in* Persoonia **1**: 222. 1960). — HOMONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. (1944), q.v. STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Ad *Henningsia* A. Möll. — The name was first validly published *in* Bot. Mitth. Tropen **8**: 44. 1895. I qualified this use as a nomen nudum but now have to reconsider this view. Möller wrote: "In *Henningsia geminella* nov. gen. et nov. spec., einem Typus der Polyporeen, werden wir eine Form antreffen, welche regelmässig einen verhältnissmässig hochorganisirten Thelephoreenzustand durchlauft, ehe die Röhren des höher entwickelten Fruchtkörpers in die Erscheinung treten." Technically this represents sufficient description to assure valid publication of both the generic and the specific name.

Hydnochaete Peck.—'Hydnaceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **5**: 96. 1956).

Hydnochaetella Sacc.—'Hydnaceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **5**: 96. 1956).

Ad *Hydnophysa* P. Henn. — Add under 'TYPE SPECIES': Imazeki (*in* J. Japan. Bot **11**: 519. 1935) concluded that *Echinodontium tinctorium* and *Hydnofomes tsugicola* were different, although congeneric species.

Ad *Hydnoporia* Murrill. — W. B. Cooke (*in* Lloydia **22**: 186. 1960) listed as type: "*Hydnum squalidum* Fr. (Synonym: *Sistotrema fuscescens* Schw., *Irpex cinnamomeus* Fr.)". This is an error: *Hydnum squalidum* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 420. 1821) is certainly different from *Sistotrema fuscescens* Schw. Presumably Cooke relied on Fries (Elench. **1**: 139. 1828) who included Schweinitz's species as variety *β.* under *Hydnum squalidum.*

Ad *Inodermus* Quél. — Add the following at the end of the discussion on "TYPIFICATION": It should be pointed out that the year following the introduction of this genus Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 143. 1887) accepted it and listed as "Espèces principales: *I. hispidus*, *I. cuticularis*, *I. rheades*, etc.", without mention of *Polyporus radiatus* (Sow.) per Fr. in this connection or under any other generic name, however.

Ad *Inonotus* P. Karst. — Add the following REMARK. Patouillard's emendation (Hym. Eur. 140. 1887) of the genus to a group of which he merely cited as "Espèces principales: *I. nidulans*, etc." must be qualified a downright misapplication since the species mentioned was not an original one. Karsten never considered it typical of *Inonotus* and already in 1881 he based *Hapalopilus* P. Karst. on it.

Ad *Irpicochaete* J. Rick. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Irpiciochaete*"; W. B. Cooke *in* Lloydia **22**: 187. 1960.—Presumably an unintentional error.

Ad *Melanopus* Pat. — Add under 'TYPIFICATION' at the end: When Patouillard (*in* Ann. Crypt. exot **1**: 8. 1928), decided to incorporate *Polyporus scopulosus* Berk. into the genus *Melanopus*, he remarked: "On est donc amené à diviser ce dernier genre ainsi qu'il suit: / 1° *Carnosi: M. squamosus*, *M. radicatus*. 2° *Lenti: M. varius* et analogues (série typique, à chapeau mince). / 3° *Lignosi: M. scopulosus* (. . .)." This shows that Patouillard himself did not regard *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. as typical of the genus. His "série typique" contained *Polyporus varius* (Pers.) per Fr., "et analogues", which presumably also covers *Polyporus melanopus* (Pers.) per Fr.; Patouillard perhaps considered the latter species synonymous with *P. varius.*

Merulius Haller (non *Merulius* Fr.), *Merulius* Fr., *Merulius* S. F. Gray.—See Donk *in* Fungus **28**: 10, 11. 1958 under *Merulius* Fr. and *Merulius* [Haller] St.-Am. See also Part XIII of the present series (in press).

Ad *Microporus* P. Beauv. per O.K. — Add under 'VALID PUBLICATION', after the remark concerning Hariot, the following paragraph.

Perhaps the first author to accept the generic name definitely was Patouillard [*in* Ann. Jard. bot., Buitenzorg (Suppl. **1**): 111. 1897]. He did not mention it

separately but used it exclusively as the generic appellation in three specific combinations; it was not validly published by him on that occasion by the lack of a generic description or a valid reference.

Ad *Mucronoporus* Ell. & Ev. — Add to TYPIFICATION the following note: If no previous indications of type species had occurred, one would not hesitate to select *Polyporus tomentosus:* it was the only species fully described and illustrated (*pl. 8*). Of all other species listed (eleven in number) no descriptions were added except some details of the setae. First species, *Polyporus circinatus*, last species, *Polyporus balansae*. Of these two, Murrill (1903) selected the former and W. B. Cooke (1940) the latter. This later indication may perhaps be explained by a remark the authors of the generic name made in the introductory paragraph: "The only described species having this character [viz. having the inner surface of the pores studded with reddish-brown spines exactly as in the hymenium of *Hymenochaete*], so far as we know, is *Polystictus balansae*, Speg., of which Saccardo (in Syll.) remarks that it might well be the type of a new genus ('facile novum genus')." However, this does not imply that it must also be considered type of the generic name *Mucronoporus*.

Myxomyces Mont. *in* Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) IV **1**: 137. 1854 (incidental mention). — When publishing *Laschia auriscalpium* Mont., its author mentioned a generic name for it as follows: "La structure est d'ailleurs si différente, que j'avais d'abord été tenté d'en faire un nouveau genre sous le nom de *Myxomyces*. . . ." However, he did not definitely accept this name and, hence, it was not validly published even as an alternative name. *Laschia auriscalpium* will be found mentioned in connection with *Favolaschia*, q.v.

Ad *Ochroporus* J. Schroet. – TYPIFICATION. On the previous occasion I left the choice of the type species undecided between *Polyporus contiguus* (Pers.) per Fr. and *P. igniarius* (L.) per Fr. If the genus *Phellinus* Quél. is taken in the broad sense of Bourdot & Galzin Hym. France 613. 1928), inclusive of resupinate species, then *Ochroporus* with either species as type becomes a synonym of *Phellinus*. If the resupinate species are excluded then, with *Polyporus contiguus* as type, *Ochroporus* becomes the correct name for the genus which Cunningham (*in* Bull. Dept. sci. ind. Res., Pl. Dis. Div. No. 73: 1. 1948) and other authors have called *Fuscoporia* Murrill (1907); if *P. igniarius* is to be preferred, *Ochroporus* remains a synonym of *Phellinus*.

Moreover, if in the future it appears necessary to split up *Phellinus* sensu Bourd. & G. into smaller genera and at the same time one wants to retain *Polyporus rubriporus* Quél. as its type species, then presumably *Ochroporus* might be a convenient name for a genus typified by *Polyporus igniarius*. The next name to be considered for the *P. igniarius* group would be *Scindalma* [Hill] O.K. (1898) based on a somewhat dubious cushion-shaped (resupinate) species or form of that group. Next in succession would perhaps be *Pseudofomes* Lázaro (1916), but in this case, too, some degree of diversity in opinion on the correct taxonomic interpretation of the type species might be expected.

After a renewed careful examination of the question, I now believe that *P. igniarius* may be retained as type species of *Ochroporus*, and *P. contiguus*, rejected, for the following reasons. The original description reads, "Substanz der Fruchtkörper braun. Sporenpulver weiss; Membran der Sporen farblos. Die übrigen Charactere dieselbe wie bei *Polyporus*." Schroeter mentioned neither the colour of the spore print nor of the spores for *Polyporus contiguus*; in fact nothing is said of either in the description of that species. Also, it is not explicitly mentioned that the context was brown. In contrast, the description of *Polyporus igniarius* states: "Substanz, innen rostbraun" and of the spores, "... Membran farblos ...". It thus may be assumed that *P. contiguus* was placed in *Ochroporus* by implication rather than by exact knowledge of certain essential generic characters, and that for this reason, it is not a suitable lectotype. These considerations leave *P. igniarius* as the preferable type species.

Ad *Pelloporus* Quél. — Add following the first paragraph under "TYPIFICATION": Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 143. 1887) took up Quélet's genus immediately after Quélet had introduced it, listing as "Espèces principales: *P. perennis*, *P. Montagnei*, *P. fimbriatus*, etc."

Ad *Phaeoporus* J. Schroet. — I left the choice of the type species undecided between *Polyporus obliquus* (Pers.) per Fr. and *P. cuticularius* Bull. per Fr. Recently it became necessary to make a decision, and I now prefer *P. cuticularis* because it is the species which agrees best with the generic description. The latter contains, *inter alia*, "Conidien auf der Oberfläche der Fruchtkorper an kurzen Hyphen abgeschnürt; Membran braun." The only species for which Schroeter described conidia is *P. cuticularis:* "Auf der Oberfläche werden an den jungen Fruchtkörpern oft elliptische Conidien mit glatter brauner Membran abgeschnürt."

Phlebiella P. Karst.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 108. 1957 & Part XIII, in press).

Ad *Phyllodontia* P. Karst. — W. B. Cooke (*in* Lloydia **22**: 194. 1960) called the type "*P. magnus* Karst." This is an error for '*Phyllodontia magnusii* P. Karst.'

Phylloporus Quél.—Boletaceae (see Donk *in* Reinwartia **3**: 297. 1955).

Ad *Polystictus* Fr. — Insert the following paragraphs immediately after the word "TYPIFICATION".

Fries (*in* K. svenska Vet.-Akad. Handl. **1848**: 127) had conceived the taxon already before he decided to treat it as a distinct genus: originally he fused it with *Trametes* Fr.:

"*Trametes* .... Post editam Synopsin Hymenomycetum hoc genus valde dilatavimus, huc referentes omnes species suberosas l. lignosas, nec instar *Polypori* genuini e carnosolentas fibrosas, poris haud stratosis in quibus omnibus re ipsa trama a pileo formata adest, licet in diversis speciebus plus minus distincta appareat. – Ad hoc genus, quod majorem partem Polypororum exoticorum sibi vindicat ...."

"Ad stirpem *Tr. perennis* pertinent sequentes species sub *Polyporo* descriptae: a) *poris amplis trama crassa: P. maximus, Schweinizii, rufescens, radicatus* (Schwein.!) *connatus* (Schw.); b) *poris minutis, trama tenui: Tr. circinatus, tomentosus, bulbipes* (= *P. oblectans* Be[r]k.? . . .) *Cladonia* Berkl. etc. . . ..

"Alteram *Trametum mesopodium* stirpem representat *Polyporus sacer* . . ., cujus plurimas quoque habemus species. — Utraque haec series a *Polyporis* mesopodibus genuinis clare differt; et sub singula *Trametum* tribu redeunt cum his analogae species. Tantum proba distinctione *Trametum* et *Polyporum* facilem proponere licit specierum conspectum."

These remarks tend to show that the later genus *Polystictus* started with the conception of a stirps typified by *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr., in the first place, and a stirps typified by *P. sacer* Afz. ex Fr.

Porodon Fr., Syst. mycol. **1**: 459. 1821 (nomen nudum); *in* Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III **1**: 92. 1851 (nomen nudum). — When looking back on the Hymenomycetes in a brief survey of the genera, Fries introduced this generic name as a nomen nudum: "POLYPORUS abiens in Hydnum = *Porodon*. (Sistotremat. sp. Pers. Daedalea sp. Mihi. ". It is not clear which species he had in mind, but it might have been, for instance, *Daedalea biennis* (Bull.) per Fr., which he accepted on the basis of its original account (Bulliard, Champ. France *pl. 449 f. 1.* 1789; "v.i."). — I know of only one other mention of the name (cited above): when discussing *Polystictus versatilis* Berk. Fr., Fries remarked about it: "Forsan P. venusto proprior vel ad novum genus *Porodon* typo *P. Acanthoides* referendus." No generic description was given and the name only provisionally accepted. *Polyporus acanthoides* (Bull. per Mérat) Fr. sensu Fr. Epicr. 448. 1838 is a form of *Polyporus biennis* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr. as was pointed out by O. Fidalgo (*in* Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. **86**: 134. 1959), and closely related to (if not conspecific with) *Polyporus distortus* (Schw.) Steud.: Fr., the type species of the name *Abortiporus* Murrill.

Ptychogaster Corda.—Deuteromycetes (see Part XII of the present series, in press).

Ad *Rigidoporus* Murrill. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Rigidiiporus*"; W. B. Cooke *in* Lloydia **22**: 199. 1960.—Presumably an unintentional error.

Rodwaya H. & P. Syd.—Boletaceae (see Donk *in* Reinwardtia **3**: 299. 1955).

Ad *Trametes* Fr. — The type species should be cited as '*Polyporus suaveolens* (L.) per Fr. sensu Fr.' Eriksson [*in* Symb. bot. upsal. **16** (1): 140–146 *fs. 44, 45*. 1958] has shown that the original *Boletus suaveolens* L. must be equated with *Polyporus odorus* Sommerf.: Fr. = *Trametes odorata* (Sommerf.) Fr. while Fries's interpretation of it agrees with what is now currently called *Trametes suaveolens*.

Vararia P. Karst.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk *in* Taxon **6**: 121. 1957).

Ad *Xanthochrous* Pat. — Add under "TYPIFICATION": Gosselin (*in* Farlowia **1**: 526. 1944) remarked that, "In 1900, Patouillard made a new genus *Xanthochrous* based on *P. circinatus*. He described the setae as being straight. Apparently his

X. circinnatus is *P*[*olyporus*] *tomentosus* Fr." This statement is misleading in several respects: there is no indication that Patouillard 'based' the name on that species. In both the original account (1897) and that of 1900 (Essai taxon. Hym. 100) he listed as examples, *inter alia*, *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr. as well as *P. circinatus* (Fr.) Fr., without adding descriptions. However, in 1900 (*f. 56: 4*) he depicted a straight seta for *P. circinatus*, but this may be an error and a seta of this species is perhaps depicted in figure 56: 3 as "Cystide de *X. vulpinus* (Fr.)".